THE PAPERS *of the*
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY
OF AMERICA

VOLUME FORTY-TWO THIRD QUARTER, 1948

"Chapter on American Cribbage": Poe and Plagiarism

By NELSON F. ADKINS

I

"STOLEN, body and soul, (and spoilt in the stealing) from a paper *of the same title* in the 'European Magazine' for December, 1817. Blunderingly done throughout, and must have cost more trouble than an original thing. This makes paragraph 33 of my *'Chapter on American Cribbage.'* " So begins a curious memorandum on an article, unfortunately never identified, which Poe had encountered in his extensive perusal of the magazine literature of his day. This memorandum provides us with our only hint of Poe's intention to present, in systematic review, at least one phase of that subject which throughout life so stirred his critical faculties. As Poe now saw his subject, these faculties were to encounter a supreme challenge. "The beauty of the *exposés*," he promptly adds, "must lie in the precision and unanswerability with which they are given—in day and date—in chapter and verse—and, above all, in an unveiling of the minute trickeries by which the thieves hope to disguise their stolen wares. I must soon a tale unfold, and an astonishing tale it will be."[1]

[1] *United States Magazine and Democratic Review*, XV: 587 (Dec. 1844).

Though Poe never found occasion to unfold his tale, it is not wholly beyond conjecture what the outline, as well as the substance, of the tale might have been. Poe's preoccupation with plagiarism began early. In a footnote to the 1829 *Al Aaraaf, Tamerlane, and Minor Poems* he sought to reveal, for the reader's benefit, his own literary indebtedness: "Plagiarism—see the works of Thomas Moore—passim—."[2] A year or two later at West Point, so a room-mate relates, Poe, upon observing a copy of Campbell's poems lying on the table, "tossed it contemptuously aside, with the curt remark: 'Campbell is a plagiarist.' "[3] But this habit, so early acquired, had become hopelessly inveterate by the mid-forties when he launched his attacks on Longfellow, and projected the *Literati* series. Nor in the intervening years had Poe been without encouragement in the pursuit of his critical hobby. De Quincey in an English journal had openly accused Coleridge of plagiarizing from the German philosophers.[4] And an article on American poets in the *Foreign Quarterly Review* for January, 1844, could have been nothing less than a divine dispensation to the critic who for years had fought almost singlehanded the sin of plagiarism in his native land. "All poetry is imitative," asserted John Forster, the reviewer. "True poetry imitates nature: that which imitates poetry ought to have some other name." American poets in general stand convicted of "petty larceny," which "forms a prominent and ostentatious feature" of their productions.[5] Strong language this—such as Poe himself so loved to use. Yet perhaps for us the major significance of this article lies

[2] Poe, *Al Aaraaf, Tamerlane and Minor Poems*. Ed. by Thomas O. Mabbott (New York, Facsimile Text Society, 1933), p. 71. See also Arthur H. Quinn, *Edgar Allan Poe* (New York, Appleton-Century, 1941), p. 164.

[3] Thomas W. Gibson, *Poe at West Point*, in: *Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, XXXV: 754 (Nov. 1867).

[4] *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine*, I (N.S.): 511-512 (Sept. 1834).

[5] *Foreign Quarterly Review*, XXXII: 318-319 (Jan., 1944). In writing to Lowell on March 30, 1844, Poe expressed the belief that this article had been written by Dickens (George E. Woodberry, *Life of Edgar Allan Poe* [Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, 1909], II: 61, 71). Lowell, however, assured him that the author was not Dickens, but John Forster (*ibid.*, II: 89).

in the fact that Poe in the forties was not alone in his condemnation of literary imitation and plagiary. Despite his perennial antipathy to the British quarterlies, Poe must have taken an inward pleasure at finding himself in good critical company.

To Poe, however, imitation, as well as plagiarism, was a subtle and complex phase of literary art. Any discussion of this curious subject is, therefore, fraught with numerous difficulties. In the first place, Poe by no means maintained an absolute consistency in his use of the term *plagiarism.* Sometimes without warning he shifted his point of view from the ethical to the esthetic. Following the accepted moral connotation of the word, he frequently confused his critical issue by the injection of the esthetic standard. In a moment of righteous indignation, he could denounce the plagiarist as the worst of rascals—a person of debased morals—a consummate thief. "It is impossible. . . ," Poe asserts, "to imagine a more sickening spectacle than that of the plagiarist, who walks among mankind with an erecter step, and who feels his heart beat with a prouder impulse, on account of plaudits which he is conscious are the due of another. It is the purity, the nobility, the etheriality of just fame—it is the contrast between the etheriality and the grossness of the crime of theft, which places the sin of plagiarism in so detestable a light."[6] On other occasions, however, the charge of plagiarism rested on a more literary and aesthetic basis. There exist, to be sure, what Poe once denominated "wilful plagiarists,"[7] and of these he does adduce, as we shall later see, numerous outstanding examples, although none would seem to fit the heightened moral picture painted in the paragraph just examined. Poe was more often concerned not with the deliberate plagiarist as with the author who has either chosen to imitate another's style because he lacks a distinctive style of his own, or has unconsciously echoed passages from the works of a greater artist. Poe, indeed, acknowledged with meas-

[6] Poe, *The Literati* (New York, J. S. Redfield, 1850), p. 570.

[7] *Broadway Journal,* I: 150 (Mar. 8, 1845).

ured judgment that "the charge of plagiarism . . . is a purely literary one; and a plagiarism even distinctly proved by no means necessarily involves any moral delinquency."[8] And Poe once observed, with an even deeper insight into the creative mind, that plagiarism becomes even with the great writer virtually inevitable. In once presenting a list of alleged plagiarisms by famous poets, Poe declared:

> I would have no difficulty in filling two ordinary novel volumes with just such concise parallels as these. Nevertheless, I am clearly of opinion that of one hundred plagiarisms of this character, seventy-five would be, not accidental, but unintentional. The poetic sentiment implies an abnormally keen appreciation of poetic excellence, with an unconscious assimilation of it into the poetic entity, so that an admired passage, being forgotten and afterwards reviving through an exceedingly shadowy train of association, is supposed by the plagiarizing poet to be really the coinage of his own brain. An uncharitable world, however, will never be brought to understand all this, and the poet who commits a plagiarism is, if not criminal, at least unlucky; and equally in either case does critical justice require the right of property to be traced home.[9]

Yet the point at which the plagiary passes from the subconscious to the conscious—from what is an echo of the greater writer to what has been deliberately stolen, Poe never clearly defined, no doubt because of the human impossibility, on the part of poet and critic alike, of drawing the line of demarcation. This difficulty, often amounting to one of critical insuperability, Poe once suggested in a remark on Longfellow, that the chief sin of the New England poet was imitation—"an imitation sometimes verging on downright theft."[10]

In addition to these critical obstacles arising partly from Poe's confusion of the moral and aesthetic, and partly from the very subtlety of the subject itself, were certain personal elements sometimes affecting his judgments. George Graham, who knew Poe well, discovered the source of the poet's preoccupation with plagiarism in the peculiarities of his temperament. "It was an

[8] *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book*, XXXIII: 16 (July, 1846).

[9] *Ibid.*, XXXI: 121 (Sept. 1845).

[10] *Graham's Lady's and Gentleman's Magazine*, XIX: 229 (Nov. 1841).

occupation," Graham asserts, "peculiarly suited to his captious, scrutinizing, analytical mind, to his doubting and suspicious temper, to his peculiar notions concerning evidence, ratiocination, to his wide and discursive reading, to his fine poetic memory, and to his peculiar habits of finding proofs in trifles light as air, and of seeking for them in the most improbable places and manners. . . . He had a blood-hound's nose for a fancied plagiarism, . . ."[11] Thus Poe's analytical bias, coupled with what can be called by no other name than pedantry, certainly led him at moments to lodge a charge of imitation or plagiarism on the weakest possible evidence. Again, his love of the smart, witty generalization was responsible for more than one unhappy accusation. A critic after Poe's death especially noted his "habit of insinuating the charge, instead of proving it. . . . The fact was, that on this matter of plagiarism his personal feelings were early involved, and became so interwoven with his critical opinions, that he was necessarily inconsistent, . . ."[12] No one familiar with Poe's critical writings will doubt that his personal feelings *did* at times enter unfortunately into his critical judgments. When he wished to be invidious, he could, and did, call an author a plagiarist. In the case of Thomas Dunn English, his charges are nowhere really sustained.

These difficulties encountered in any study of Poe's charges of plagiarism we must keep clearly before us. Yet it is equally imperative to realize that, despite Poe's critical inconsistencies, despite his desire at times to display his knowledge of literature, and despite his smartness and occasional meanness, his concern with plagiarism represents a cardinal principle in his critical appraisals. It becomes, in reality, a way of testing the work of the literary artist in arriving at a final evaluation of his output. And I should here like to express the conviction that, again despite some unhappy lapses, Poe often employed this touchstone with eminent success.

[11] *Ibid.*, XLIV: 222 (Feb. 1854).

[12] *North American Review*, LXXXIII: 443-444 (Oct. 1856).

II

The significance of this touchstone, at once so subtle and elusive, lay in the importance which Poe attached to *originality* in all creative expression. The idea is variously phrased by Poe. ". . . no work of art can embody within itself a proper originality without giving the plainest manifestations of the creative spirit, or, in more common parlance, of *genius* in its author."[13] ". . . every writer is false to his own interest if he fails to avail himself, at the outset, of the effect which is certainly and invariably derived from the great element, *novelty*."[14] Indeed, Poe frequently chose to equate *originality*, *novelty*, and *strangeness*, and to discover by their presence in any literary work the marks of true genius. "Take away this element of strangeness—of unexpectedness—of novelty—of originality—call it what we will—and all that is *etheral* in loveliness is lost at once."[15] In examining Lowell's *Fable for Critics*, Poe asks in disgust, "Is there *no* originality on the face of the earth?"[16] "But originality," he asserts elsewhere with greater sobriety, "as it is one of the highest, is also one of the rarest of merits." And he adds, perhaps echoing the critic of the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, "In America it is especially, and very remarkably rare. . . ."[17] His advice to America was simply this: "We must neglect our models and study our capabilities."[18]

In examining more concretely the critical grounds on which Poe rested his charges of imitation and plagiarism, we should note that he regarded "autorial originality, properly considered . . . threefold."

1. . . . the originality of the general thesis
2. that of the several incidents, or thoughts by which the thesis is developed

[13] *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book*, XXXI: 263 (Dec. 1845).
[14] *Ibid.*, XXXI: 263.
[15] *Graham's American Monthly Magazine*, XXVIII: 116 (Mar. 1846).
[16] *Southern Literary Messenger*, XV: 190 (Mar. 1849).
[17] *American Review*, II: 126 (Aug. 1845).
[18] *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book*, XXXI: 122 (Sept. 1845).

> 3. that of manner, or *tone*, by which means alone, an old subject, even when developed through hackneyed incidents or thoughts, may be made to produce a fully original *effect*— . . .[19]

Here are principles referable alike to drama, prose fiction, or poetry. Fortunately, Poe once defined briefly his idea of originality in character. A character in fiction may be presented as having "qualities known in real life, but never before depicted." This combination, however, Poe believed "nearly impossible." More within the range of the artist's capability is the character "presenting qualities (moral, or physical, or both) which, although unknown, or even known to be hypothetical, are so skillfully adapted to the circumstances which surround them, that our sense of fitness is not offended, and we find ourselves seeking a reason why those things *might not have been*, which we are still satisfied *are not*. The latter species of originality appertains to the loftier regions of the *Ideal*."[20] Poe seems here to suggest so apt a psychological adjustment between the character and his environment that the reader perforce ascribes reality to the character even in spite of the dictates of reason. Here, I take it, Poe looks in part for originality of character to "that willing suspension of disbelief" which Coleridge considered so essential a part of the effect produced by supernatural writing. In his definition of character, Poe is plainly no more concerned with photographic realism than was Coleridge. Poe's idea of originality clearly transcended gross reality, and appertained "to the loftier regions of the *Ideal;*" otherwise, "all that is *etheral* in loveliness is lost at once."

The point here stressed by Poe must be held firmly in mind if we are to understand his dislike of imitation, which he once asserted "is an enemy to the best interests of everything of which we have any acquaintance."[21] There is no doubt that this unqualified abhorrence of imitation rested in part on Poe's conviction

[19] *American Review*, II: 126 (Aug. 1845).

[20] *The Literati*, p. 595.

[21] *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine*, V: 333 (Dec. 1839).

that great art never reproduces reality *per se*. Now the bourgeois America of the thirties and forties Poe deemed obsessed by "the evil genius of the mere matter of fact."[22] "Our anti-romantic national character" had at one time threatened to degrade "all American literature to the level of Flemish art," although Poe in the forties fancied he perceived a "decline of the miserable rant and cant against originality, . . ."[23] In any case, "the love of novelty," he asserts, "is an indisputable element of the moral nature of man, . . ."[24] And to imitate nature directly is in no case the province of genius. "Were I called on to define, *very* briefly, the term 'Art,' " Poe remarks, "I should call it 'the reproduction of what the Senses perceive in Nature through the veil of the soul.' The mere imitation, however accurate, of what *is* Nature, entitles no man to the sacred name of 'Artist.' . . . The grapes of Zeuxis were in-artistic—unless in a bird's eye view."[25] And just as "the apparent not the real, is the province of a painter,"[26] so too the form of music which imitates gives rise to an inferior form of pleasure. In music where indefiniteness and ideality are the prime factors, "attempts at absolute *imitation* in musical sounds" are especially regrettable. "Who can forget the failings of the Battles of Prague? What man of true taste is not ready to weep over their interminable guns, drums, trumpets, blunderbusses, and thunder?"[27] And Poe likewise observed that "descriptive poetry, even in its happiest manifestation, is *not* of the highest order."[28] In his famous review of Longfellow's *Ballads and Other Poems* (1842), Poe asserts:

> . . . just as the eyes of Amaryllis are repeated in the mirror, or the living lily in the lake, so is the mere *record* of these forms and colors and sounds and senti-

[22] *Ibid.*, V: 171 (Sept. 1839).
[23] *Ibid.*, V: 170.
[24] *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book*, XXXI: 49 (August, 1845).
[25] *Southern Literary Messenger*, XV: 337 (June, 1849).
[26] *Ibid.*, II: 193 (Feb. 1836).
[27] *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine*, V: 332 (Dec. 1839).
[28] *Graham's American Monthly Magazine*, XXXIV: 364 (June, 1849).

ments—so is their mere oral or written repetition a duplicate source of delight. But this repetition is not Poesy. He who shall merely sing with whatever rapture, in however harmonious strains, or with however vivid a truth of imitation, of the sights and sounds which greet him in common with all mankind—he, we say, has yet failed to prove his title divine. There is still a longing unsatisfied, which he has been impotent to fulfil. . .[29]

It should here be observed that these examples of artistic imitation concern themselves with the reproduction in art of the details of nature. Nor does Poe always distinguish clearly between this species of imitation and the imitation of another work of art. But that the two were intimately related in Poe's mind we may readily see. For whether the artist merely photographs nature, or consciously employs a great model, the *ideal*, the essence of all true art, is irretrievably lost. Hence imitation on either plane means artistic stagnation. This relation is clearly implied in Poe's essay *The American Drama:*

The great opponent to Progress is Conservatism. In other words—the great adversary of Invention is Imitation:—the propositions are in spirit identical. Just as an art is imitative, is it stationary. The most imitative arts are the most prone to repose—and the converse.

Here Poe is speaking both of the imitation *per se* of nature, and the imitation of the artistic model. He continues:

Sculptors, painters, dramatists, are, from the very nature of their material,—their spiritual material—imitators—conservatists—prone to repose in old Feeling and in antique Taste. For this reason—and for this reason only—the arts of Sculpture, Painting and the Drama have not advanced—or have advanced feebly, and inversely in the ratio of their imitativeness.

If sculptors, painters, dramatists, because of the "very nature of their material," must draw the substance of their art from nature or life, there is little at their command to encourage originality. Imitation leads at once to conservatism; the dramatist easily drops into *clichés*, and instinctively falls back on the work of his predecessors. Thus from the imitation of nature, the dramatist has turned to the imitation of dramatic models, which presumably

[29] *Ibid.*, XX: 248 (April, 1842).

hold in solution the essence or spirituality of dramatic action. Poe complains of the drama of his day, "We are content if, with Feeling and Taste, a dramatist does as *other dramatists have done.*" He cites the example of Sheridan Knowles, and his "most preposterous series of imitations of the Elizabethan drama, . . ."[30] Bulwer likewise may be said to have written a good play "only when we think of him in connexion with the still more contemptible 'old-dramatist' imitators who are his contemporaries and friends."[31] Thus "the drama, as the chief of the imitative arts, has a tendency to beget and keep alive in its votaries the imitative propensity."[32] Emerson and Poe, it is true, had little in common, and the opinion which each had of the other was not high, yet both these Americans found themselves on common ground in their dislike of dramatic imitation. "The Elizabethan theatre should be abandoned,"[33] Poe once declared; in *The American Scholar* Emerson too lamented that "The English dramatic poets have Shakespearized now for two hundred years."[34]

It is now evident that in his condemnation of imitation, Poe was at odds not only with Aristotle, as by extension his theory of imitation may be interpreted, but also with Pope and the neo-classicists as well.

> Learn hence for ancient rules a just esteem;
> To copy nature is to copy them.[35]

For Poe, the great artist *copies* nothing—nature or rules! Beholden to these for none of his effects, the genius rises directly to the realm of the ideal. The late Margaret Alterton has suggested Plato as a source of the idea that the reproduction of the details of nature is not poetry; she further derives from Plato, Poe's belief that, by aiming at totality of effect in art, the genius lifts his

[30] *American Review*, II: 117-118 (Aug. 1845).
[31] *Southern Literary Messenger*, XV: 295 (May, 1849).
[32] *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book*, XXXI: 50 (Aug. 1845).
[33] *Broadway Journal*, I: 205 (Mar. 29, 1845).
[34] *Nature, Addresses and Lectures* (Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, 1903), p. 91.
[35] *Essay on Criticism*, I: 139-140.

work above the gross world of reality—the mere imitation of nature.[36] Poe insists that if drama is to advance, "Feeling and taste" must be "guided and controlled in every particular by the details of Reason—of Common Sense—in a word, of a Natural Art."[37] This principle, which Poe shows involves the destruction of the "old models," seems to concern the transcendent aim of the great artist. Only through the use of reason or art is originality finally to be attained. As all students of Poe are aware, unity or totality of effect constituted a master principle in the attainment of this transcendent or original quality. Yet the term *Natural Art* would appear to imply a freedom on the part of the artist in working out his problem—a freedom which, if properly employed, would result in that mysterious and indefinable essence we call *originality*.

Albeit clinging to the master principle of Unity, Poe clearly stood for the liberation of the literary craftsman from the artistic formulae of the past. It is hard to conceive of Poe as approving the innumerable rules laid down by the modern technician of the short story. For these, in uninspired hands, inevitably reduce the art of fiction to the status of imitation—of plagiarism. Dickens, Poe believed, had "perfected a standard from which art itself will derive its essence in rules." Yet, as we shall later note, those authors who had the misfortune slavishly to imitate Dickens, Poe condemned flatly as plagiarists.[38]

In his use of the phrase *Natural Art*, and his advocacy of reason as applied to the drama, Poe seems to have had in mind an artistic procedure which he did not always fully define. True, Poe insisted that "the perfection of dramatic, as well as of plastic skill, is found not in the imitation of nature, but in the artistical adjustment and application of her features."[39] Yet he also complained

[36] Margaret Alterton, *Origins of Poe's Critical Theory* (Iowa City, University of Iowa [1925], Humanistic Studies, Vol. 2, No. 3), pp. 129-131.

[37] *American Review*, II: 118 (Aug. 1845).

[38] *The Literati*, pp. 592-593.

[39] *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine*, V: 117 (Aug. 1839).

that the poet Heber possessed "a skill in the management of his means unsurpassed by that of any writer of his time, but [he was] without any high degree of originality."[40] And with an inconsistency annoying to the critic who seeks to reduce Poe's critical dicta to a uniform pattern, Poe could occasionally declare himself in favor of what appeared to be a literal imitation. "A novel . . ." he asserts, "is a picture of real life. The plot may be involved, but it must not transcend probability. The agencies introduced must belong to real life."[41] But Poe nowhere contends that art is not concerned with nature or life. Of course, the dramatist must draw upon "the fountain of a Nature that can never grow old."[42] But how, then, are art and nature related? Poe defined the relation in an article entitled "Nature and Art" in the *Evening Mirror* for January 17, 1845:

> . . . the latter *should be* nothing more than the arranging, the methodizing, the rendering easily available so to carry into successful application, the suggestions, the laws, and *the general intentions of the former.*[43]

Again:

> . . . a greater number of striking points than are ever seen closely conjoined in reality, may, for artistical purposes, be gathered into the action of a drama—provided always that there be no absolute controversion of *nature's general intention.*[44]

A survey of Poe's criticism would seem to suggest a distinction which he tacitly sought to draw between imitating literally the concrete detail of nature or life, and basing an artistic production on the essence of nature, so that "nature's general intention" is never controverted. Thus the artist, whether he be novelist, dramatist or poet, must sublimate nature, rarefying and idealizing her lineaments.

[40] *The Literati*, p. 595.

[41] *Graham's Lady's and Gentleman's Magazine*, XX: 355 (June, 1842).

[42] *Broadway Journal*, I: 205 (Mar. 29, 1845).

[43] Italics mine.

[44] *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book*, XXXII: 136 (Mar. 1846). (Italics mine.)

III

We often think of Poe's concern with imitation and plagiarism as little more than an odd twist of a mind not too wholesome or well balanced. Yet an examination of the available evidence clearly shows that Poe had pondered long and deeply on what for the artist must constitute originality. Shelley, Poe regarded as in many ways lacking in the subtler elements pertaining to his art, and yet for Shelley "to imitate was out of the question. It would have served no purpose; for he spoke to his own spirit alone, which would have comprehended no alien tongue. Thus he was profoundly original."[45] But if Shelley never lapsed from originality, great poets, in the main, as we have already seen, "have been gross imitators," because "the poetic *sentiment* . . . leads almost inevitably to imitation."[46] It is in developing this segment of his subject that Poe reveals how fully he understood the mysteries of this strange and elusive thing which he called both *imitation* and *plagiarism.*

> What the poet intensely admires, becomes thus, in very fact, although only partially, a portion of his own intellect. It has a secondary origination within his own soul—an origination altogether apart, although springing, from its primary origination from without. The poet is thus possessed by another's thought, and cannot be said to take of it, possession. But, in either view, he thoroughly feels it *his own*—and this feeling is counteracted only by the sensible presence of its true, palpable origin in the volume from which he has derived it—an origin, in the long lapse of years it is almost impossible *not* to forget—for in the meantime the thought itself is forgotten. But the frailest association will regenerate it—it springs up with all the vigor of a new birth—its absolute originality is not even a matter of suspicion—and when the poet has written it and printed it, and on its account is charged with plagiarism, there will be no one in the world more entirely astounded than himself.[47]

Thus Poe draws the conclusion that the possibility of plagiarism is "in the direct ratio of the poetic sentiment—of the susceptibility to the poetic impression;" and "for the most frequent and pal-

[45] *Southern Literary Messenger,* XV: 293 (May, 1849).
[46] *United States Magazine and Democratic Review,* XXIII: 270 (Apr. 1846).
[47] *Broadway Journal,* I: 212 (Apr. 5, 1845).

pable plagiarisms, we must search the works of the most eminent poets."[48] In *Pinakidia* Poe cites numerous examples of the way famous English poets have drawn upon one another for their ideas and phrasing.[49]

More prone, however, to conscious imitation is the popular artist, with whom plagiarism, in Poe's opinion, is again inevitable. In discussing Charles Lever's *Charles O'Malley*, Poe quotes the English artist, Henry Howard, on the subject of imitation of nature. Howard observes,

> The pleasure that results from it, even when employed upon the most ordinary materials, will always render that property of our art the most attractive with the majority, because it may be employed with the least mental exertion.[50]

Originality, which Poe associated with ideality and novelty, is not for the populace, who, in the main, find their enjoyments in mundane pursuits. The popular poet must speak a universal language. His utterance, passionate in nature, perforce abounds in phrases and figures that possess universal currency. In fine, the popular poet, writing in conventional patterns, must imitate and plagiarize.

But if the poet of the masses finds it difficult to speak a language fresh and original, the poet of the study, with his face to the pages of dusty books, again succumbs to the sin of imitation. In recalling those scholars who have sought eminence in imaginative literature, Poe asks, "Can there be anything in the nature of a 'classical' life at war with novelty *per se?* At all events, few fine scholars . . . *are* original."[51] Poe, it is true, defends Charles Anthon and Alexander Keith against charges of plagiarism brought against

[48] *Ibid.*, I: 212.

[49] *Southern Literary Messenger*, II: 576 (Aug. 1836).

[50] *Graham's Lady's and Gentleman's Magazine*, XX: 187 (Mar. 1842). The source of this quotation has thus far eluded me. It does not occur in Howard's posthumous volume *A Course of Lectures on Painting* (London, 1848), a work which post-dates the use of the quotation by six years. Neither could Poe have examined before writing the review, a series of what are apparently stenographic reports on some of Howard's lectures before the Royal Society appearing in the *Anglo-American* in May and June, 1843.

[51] *The Literati*, p. 595.

them by contemporary critics.[52] But of Elizabeth Barrett and Richard Horne (author of *Orion*), he speaks less assuringly. "Her sense of Art is pure in itself," he remarks of Miss Barrett, "but has been contaminated by pedantic study of false models—a study which has the more easily led her astray, because she placed an undue value upon it as rare—as alien to her character of a woman."[53] As for Mr. Horne, his use of "Greek and Roman fables" has enfeebled his work, and deprived it in some degree of its originality.[54] Even Milton's great learning ". . . enslaved his mind and injured his work," a fact "shown by his borrowing imagery and incidents from Greek and Latin authors and firing his imagination with them."[55]

Poe, indeed, seems to have left no area of his subject unexplored; and in the lack of international copyright, a subject with which Poe was much concerned, he discovered a final source of imitation. The lack of proper copyright laws has diverted the writing of literature to our "gentlemen of elegant leisure."

> . . . and mere gentlemen of elegant leisure have been noted, time out of mind, for the insipidity of their productions. In general, too, they are obstinately conservative, and this feeling leads them into imitation of foreign, more especially of British models. This is one main source of the imitativeness with which, as a people, we have been justly charged. . . .[56]

Any examination of Poe's principles touching the problem of plagiarism leads, it seems to me, to one conclusion: the man's essential sincerity in the charges which he was continually making. In art, Poe stood for *genius*, and what must inevitably be the product of genius, *originality*. This high critical purpose Poe stated unequivocally in these words:

[52] *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book*, XXXII: 268 (June, 1846); *New York Review*, I: 357-358 (Oct. 1837).

[53] *Broadway Journal*, I: 20 (Jan. 11, 1845).

[54] *Graham's Lady's and Gentleman's Magazine*, XXIV: 138 (Mar. 1844).

[55] E. M. Alfriend, *Unpublished Recollections of Edgar Allan Poe*, in: *Literary Era*, VIII: 491 (Aug. 1901). Cf. Emerson: "Milton was too learned, though I hate to say it. It wrecked his originality." (*Journals*, III: 328).

[56] *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book*, XXXI: 121 (Sept. 1845).

It is, in brief, the duty of all whom circumstances have led into criticism—it is, at least, a duty from which *we* individually shall never shrink—to uphold the true dignity of genius, to combat its degradation, to plead for the exercise of its powers in those bright fields which are its legitimate and peculiar province, and which for it alone lie gloriously outspread.[57]

IV

Such was, indeed, Poe's high critical purpose, but personal feeling, as well as a weak and erratic will, often caused him to render judgments dictated by impulse or caprice. A brief survey of specific charges will demonstrate how fickle and unreliable his accusations of imitation and plagiarism could frequently be. It is, for example, surprising to discover that he ignores Bryant's obvious indebtedness to Wordsworth. In Poe's four reviews and criticisms of Bryant's poems, starting in 1837, the English poet is never once mentioned as the possible inspiration for part of Bryant's verse. *Thanatopsis* and *A Forest Hymn* incite Poe to no charges of plagiarism; and the lyric *Oh, Fairest of the Rural Maids!* he insists is "a gem, of which we cannot sufficiently express our admiration."[58] Lowell's *The Legend of Brittany*, an early imitation of Keats, Poe declares "decidedly the noblest poem, of the same length, written by an American."[59] Of the writings of Thomas Holley Chivers, Poe naïvely inquires, "Is it not, indeed, a miracle that *today* a poet shall compose sixty or seventy poems, in which there shall be discoverable *no* taint—absolutely none—of either Byron, or Shelley, a Wordsworth, a Coleridge, a Tennyson?"[60]

But with an ear trained to detect the slightest literary echo, Poe after all neglected few opportunities to assert his disapproval of an alleged fault, though his eagerness to press the charge led him too often to ignore the evidence. In his searing review

[57] *Graham's Lady's and Gentleman's Magazine*, XX: 187 (Mar. 1842).

[58] *Southern Literary Messenger*, III: 48 (Jan. 1837). See also *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine*, VI: 204-205 (May, 1940).

[59] *Southern Literary Messenger*, XV: 190 (Mar. 1849).

[60] *Broadway Journal*, II: 55 (Aug. 2, 1845).

of Rufus Dawes' poems Poe observes "a peculiar imitative speciousness of manner pervading the surface of his writing," yet the only specific point which he cites in evidence is that the poem *Geraldine* had *Don Juan* as its model.[61] In commenting on a single verse in one of Cornelius Mathews' poems, Poe is restrained "from declaring, flatly, that the line is not the property of Mr. Mathews, [only] because we have not at hand the volume from which we believe it to be stolen."[62] Equally irresponsible, though now tempered by humor, is Poe's arraignment of two chapters in Captain Marryat's *Diary in America*. "A considerable, nay, the largest portion of the matter" of these chapters "is but a reprint *from other works of various natures and merits;* we wish the veracious captain had attended to the advice contained in the old epigram—

> The stolen part is much the best,
> Take courage, Frank, and steal the rest."[63]

But Poe knew too well how feeble and inept is the charge without the chapter and verse. In his memorandum on *American Cribbage*, it may be recalled, Poe had observed that "the beauty of the *exposés* must lie in the precision and unanswerability with which they are given." And more often than not he did adduce some evidence. Needless to say, Poe was never so happy as when he fancied the source of a plagiarism to lie in his own work. Yet seldom did he present his evidence with "precision and unanswerability." In his critical analysis of Thomas Ward's verses, Poe gently insinuates that a few lines of the author may not be "altogether original" with the poet, and then quotes to little purpose a few lines from his then obscure poem *Al Aaraaf*.[64] Somewhat more convincing are passages in William Lord's poems, which, Poe believed, had their origin in his own works. Poe flattered himself that Lord, for poetic imagery and phrasing, had drawn upon

[61] *Graham's Lady's and Gentleman's Magazine*, XXI: 205-209 (Oct. 1842).
[62] *Ibid.*, XX: 131 (Feb. 1842).
[63] *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine*, VI: 105 (Feb. 1840). Italics mine.
[64] *Graham's Magazine*, XXII: 197 (Mar. 1843).

Lenore, *Al Aaraaf*, and *The Haunted Palace*; and one would hardly dispute Lord's debt to Poe in the lines:

> And the aged beldames napping,
> Dreamed of gently rapping, rapping,
> With a hammer gently tapping,
> Tapping on an infant's skull.[65]

With an obvious feeling of pleasure Poe regarded Eugène Sue's possible use of *The Murders in the Rue Morgue* in *The Mysteries of Paris*. In pointing out that his own story had been published in translation in a French paper, Poe observes, "I do not wish, of course, to look upon M. Sue's adaptation of my property in any other light than that of a compliment." Then he cautiously adds, "The similarity *may* have been entirely accidental."[66] But Poe exerted much less caution in his accusation of Hawthorne. A part of *Howe's Masquerade* could well have been plagiarized from *William Wilson*—the parallels presented with such care almost *proved* the case.[67] But Poe had neglected to inform himself regarding the dates when the respective stories were published.

Poe's contempt for the wilful plagiarist led him to bring to light numerous instances of literary theft beyond the shadow of a doubt. With such cases Poe would surely have dealt mercilessly in his *Chapter on American Cribbage*, where he aimed to unveil "the minute trickeries by which the thieves hope to disguise their stolen wares." George Hill in a poem seems clearly to have drawn upon Edward Pinckney's *A Health*,[68] and Richard Dodson's *A Christian Carol* is patently an audacious paraphrase of Mrs. Hemans' *Hymn for Christmas*.[69] Not often did Poe employ the withering irony used in his review of Morris Mattson's *Paul Ulric*, a book Poe profoundly disliked. Innocently the critic observes that Isaac D'Israeli was "one of the most scoundrelly plagiarists

[65] *Broadway Journal*, I: 330 (May 24, 1845).
[66] *Graham's American Monthly Magazine*, XXIX: 246 (Nov. 1846).
[67] *Ibid.*, XX: 299-300 (May, 1842).
[68] *Southern Literary Messenger*, XV: 220 (Apr. 1849).
[69] *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine*, V: 328 (Dec. 1839).

in Christendom. He has not scrupled to steal entire passages verbatim from Paul Ulric!" The passages are then quoted, and Poe concludes, "Well, Mr. Mattson, what have you to say for yourself? Is not I. D'Israeli the most impudent thief since the days of Prometheus?"[70] But the thieves were not all Americans. A writer in an English magazine, Poe ably demonstrates, committed a shocking plagiarism from William E. Channing's essay on Napoleon.[71]

But Poe's concern is not usually with obvious plagiarism of this type. In a majority of cases, he is plainly dealing with borrowings of far subtler essence, so that the sin becomes essentially esthetic. If America has failed to produce a great literature, that failure is due, in part, Poe insists, "to the colonial sin of imitation. We content ourselves . . . with doing what, however well done, has yet been done *ad nauseum*."[72] Much, then, of Poe's preoccupation with plagiarism relates to the failure of Young America to stand squarely and honestly on her own artistic feet. Again he believed as sincerely as did Emerson, although he might have been loth to admit it, in the urgency of an American literary independence. We cannot "always be fed on the sere remains of foreign harvests." A national literature we may never achieve (perhaps we should not strive to achieve it!), but literary integrity *is* within our reach.

In citing an American author for imitation or plagiarism, Poe often sought to show that the writer had simply followed the style of an English exemplar. James McHenry's blank verse epic *The Antediluvians* has been "copied, but 'longo intervallo' after Paradise Lost. Had Milton never written poetry, Dr. McHenry would never have published bombast."[73] Poe comments on Charles F. Briggs:

Mr. Briggs' manner . . . is an obvious imitation of Smollett, and, as usual with

[70] *Southern Literary Messenger*, 179-180 (Feb. 1836).

[71] *Graham's American Monthly Magazine*, XXXII: 130-131 (Feb. 1848).

[72] *Southern Literary Messenger*, XV: 189 (Mar. 1849).

[73] *Graham's Lady's and Gentleman's Magazine*, XVIII: 93 (Feb. 1841).

all imitation, produces an unfavorable impression upon those conversant with the original. It is a common failing, also, with imitators, to out-Herod Herod in aping the peculiarities of the model, and too frequently the faults are more pertinaciously exaggerated than the merits. Thus, the author of "Harry Franco" carries the simplicity of Smollett sometimes to insipidity, and his picturesque low-life is made to degenerate into sheer vulgarity.[74]

Scott, Poe believes, has been in part the model for James S. French's *Elkswatawa*[75] and Robert M. Bird's *The Hawks of Hawk Hollow*.[76] Poe's dislike of the New England transcendentalists led him to accuse them of deriving their style and substance from Carlyle; and Poe once expressed the belief that Seneca's 114th Epistle, in which is described "the aping of Sallust by Aruntius," pictures "to the life" Emerson's aping of Carlyle.[77] The poet William E. Channing, with whom Poe dealt with unmitigated harshness, had also been "inoculated . . . with *virus* from Tennyson and from Carlyle."[78] Illustrative, however, of the type of unhappy generalization into which Poe could sometimes fall is his unqualified assertion that "the quips, quirks, and curt oracularities of the Emersons, Alcots [*sic*] and Fullers, are simply Lily's Euphuisms revived."[79] Strangely enough, there are moments when Poe discerns a certain piquancy and charm in a literary imitation. This comment on N. P. Willis views the subject of imitation in a manner seldom found elsewhere in Poe's criticism.

The imitation of Elia is not only an exquisite imitation, but evinces a close affinity of intellect between the imitator and the imitated. We are quite sure no man in America can, more fully than Mr. Willis, enter into the soul of Charles Lamb.

And yet, Poe adds, "To originality he has little claim—his *manner*—the touchstone of the essayist—is not peculiarly his own."[80]

[74] *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book*, XXXII: 199 (May, 1846).
[75] *Southern Literary Messenger*, II: 591 (Aug. 1836).
[76] *Ibid.*, II: 43 (Dec. 1835).
[77] *Graham's American Monthly Magazine*, XXIX: 313 (Dec. 1846).
[78] *Ibid.*, XXIII: 113 (Aug. 1843).
[79] *Ibid.*, XXXVI: 49 (Jan. 1850).
[80] *Southern Literary Messenger*, II: 600 (Aug. 1836).

To an even greater degree than the prose writers, the poets of America, in Poe's opinion, failed in artistic integrity. The writings of some of the earlier English satirists—especially Dryden and Pope—were largely responsible for Lambert A. Wilmer's *The Quacks of Helicon.*[81] Some of the verses of J. G. E. Brainard,[82] Ralph Hoyt,[83] and Bayard Taylor[84] put Poe in mind of Thomas Campbell. Nor did the female poets, of whom Poe always spoke in softened, measured tones, wholly escape the critic's censure. "Miss Gould has much in common with Mary Howitt . . . ,"[85] and of Mrs. Sigourney, Poe confesses that he has watched "with a species of anxiety and vexation . . . the progressive steps by which she has at length acquired the title of the 'American Hemans.' "[86] But Poe takes special pains to defend Catherine Sedgwick against the charge that she is an imitator of Maria Edgeworth.[87]

Poe's method of handling the literary defects of those authors who now follow, differs somewhat from his treatment of the preceding group only in that, in most cases, he has been careful to cite chapter, if not always verse, for the imitation. Poe deplored a species of literary elegance which he repeatedly observed in his contemporaries. Thus Charles Sprague in his *Shakespeare Ode* has copied the manner of Collins' *Ode to the Passions,*[88] so sacrificing originality to a specious elegance. Halleck,[89] Dawes,[90] and Calvert[91] have added little to their reputation by affecting the style of the popular *Don Juan.* Trumbull's *M'Fingal* is diluted

[81] *Graham's Lady's and Gentleman's Magazine,* XIX: 90 (Aug. 1841).

[82] *Ibid.,* XX: 121 (Feb. 1842).

[83] *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book,* XXXII: 269 (June, 1846).

[84] *Southern Literary Messenger,* XV: 221 (Apr. 1849). For the vogue of Campbell's poetry in America, see Charles Duffy, *Thomas Campbell and America,* in: *American Literature,* XIII: 346-355 (Jan. 1942).

[85] *United States Magazine and Democratic Review,* XV: 584 (Dec. 1844).

[86] *Southern Literary Messenger,* II: 112 (Jan. 1836).

[87] *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book,* XXXIII: 130 (Sept. 1846).

[88] *Graham's Lady's and Gentleman's Magazine,* XX: 44 (Jan. 1842).

[89] *Ibid.,* XXIII: 161 (Sept. 1843).

[90] *Ibid.,* XIX: 229 (Nov. 1841); XXI: 206 (Oct. 1842).

[91] *Ibid.,* XIX: 277 (Dec. 1841).

Hudibras;[92] Osborn's *The Vision of Rubeta* stems from *The Dunciad;*[93] and Lowell's *A Fable for Critics* has relied too closely on Hunt's *Feast of the Poets* and Byron's *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers.*[94] In defending William G. Simms against the charge of plagiarism, Poe points out that "the original tale . . .—the germ of 'Martin Faber'—was written long before the publication of 'Miserrimus';"[95] yet, he notes, "The individual minds which originated the two stories have much in them of similarity. . . ."[96] It is important to observe that Poe did not fail to see that likeness in style, as well as in matter, might be traced at times to a species of spiritual consanguinity.

Poe could find few American novels to which he was willing to apply the term *original.* True, Lydia M. Child's *Philothea* and Robert M. Bird's *Sheppard Lee* were exceptions. Of the latter work Poe wrote, "Like *Philothea,* this novel is an original in *American* Belles Lettres at least, and these deviations, however indecisive, from the more beaten paths of imitation, look well for our future literary prospects."[97] But in reviewing Cooper's *Wyandotté* Poe declared that "There is nothing *original* in this story." After enumerating several episodes, he adds, ". . . these, we say, are incidents which have been the common property of every novelist since the invention of letters."[98] Nothing so stirred Poe's critical sense into action as to detect, in the limits of a single novel, the coalition of several literary influences. Thus in reviewing *The Damsel of Darien,* Poe seeks to demonstrate that Simms had imitated Scott and Bulwer.[99] Further, the banditti scene in Mattson's *Paul Ulric* has been concocted from *Gil Blas, Pelham,* and *Anne of Geierstein;* and Poe illustrates in detail the author's indebtedness

[92] *Southern Literary Messenger,* XV: 189 (Mar. 1849).
[93] *Ibid.,* XV: 189.
[94] *Ibid.,* XV: 190.
[95] *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book,* XXXII: 41 (Jan. 1846).
[96] *Broadway Journal,* II: 190 (Oct. 4, 1845).
[97] *Southern Literary Messenger,* II: 662 (Sept. 1836).
[98] *Graham's Magazine,* XXIII: 262 (Nov. 1843).
[99] *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine,* V: 284 (Nov. 1839).

to these three novels.[100] Similarly in Cockton's *Stanley Thorn*, Poe lists a series of alleged plagiarisms which, I believe, are worth our special notice for the way in which he sought at moments to trap the "consummate plagiarist":

> There is not a *good* incident in his book(?) of which we cannot point out the paternity with at least a sufficient precision. The opening adventures are all *in the style* of "Cyril Thornton." Bob, following Amelia in disguise, is borrowed from one of the Smollet [*sic*] or Fielding novels—there are many of our readers who will be able to say *which*. The cab driven over the Crescent *trottoir*, is from Pierce Egan. The swindling tricks of Colonel Something, at the commencement of the novel, and of Captain Filcher afterwards, are from "Pickwick Abroad." The doings at Madame Pompour's (or some such name), with the description of Isabelle, are from "Ecarté, or The Salons of Paris"—a *rich* book. The Sons-of-Glory scene (or its *wraith*) we have seen *somewhere*, while (not to be tedious,) the whole account of Stanley's election, from his first conception of the design, through the entire canvass, the purchasing of the "Independents," the row at the hustings, the chairing, the feast, and the petition,—is so obviously *stolen* from *Ten Thousand a-Year*, as to be disgusting. Bob and the "old venerable"—what are they but feeble reflections of young and old Weller? The *tone* of the narration throughout is an absurd *echo* of Boz. For example—" 'We've come agin about them there little accounts of ourn—question is do you mean to settle 'em or don't you?' His colleagues, by whom he was backed, highly approved of this question, and winked and nodded with the view of intimating to each other that in their judgment that was the point." Who so dull as to give Mr. Bogton any more credit for these things than we give the buffoon for the *rôle* which he has committed to memory?[101]

But Poe could bring the same minute evidence to bear upon poems. In Hirst's *The Coming of the Mammoth* he finds "not a single poem . . . which does not remind us, instantly, of some other composition," and, to make good his assertion, he notes at least three of Hirst's poems which have supposedly been inspired by poems of Mathews, Neal, and Bryant.[102] Poe insists that James Aldrich's *Pretty, Fairy Molly Gray* "will put every reader in mind of Tennyson's 'Airy, fairy Lillian!' "[103] And the line in Mathews'

[100] *Southern Literary Magazine*, II: 175 (Feb. 1836).

[101] *Graham's Lady's and Gentleman's Magazine*, XX: 70 (Jan. 1842).

[102] *Broadway Journal*, II: 7-9 (July 12, 1846).

[103] *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book*, XXXIII: 16 (July, 1846).

Wakondah, "Two seeming creatures of the oak-shadowed air" was surely stolen from Campbell, who, in turn, had stolen it from Freneau: "The hunter and the deer a shade."[104] But Poe could use this method of parallelism with a deadly humor that damned forever the work he was reviewing. In presenting to his readers Seba Smith's Indian poem *Powhatan*, Poe slyly admits that he is "growing scurrilous," yet proceeds with a final thrust. After quoting an extended passage from Smith's unspeakable "doggerel," he remarks that he greatly prefers *John Gilpin* and *Old Grimes*. Then he notes several more lines from *Powhatan:*

> Their werowance look'd stern at me,
> And I looked stern at him.—

"This part . . ." observes Poe, "is not quite *original* with Mr. Downing[105]—is it? We merely ask for information. Have we not heard something about

> 'An old crow sitting on a hickory limb
> Who winked at me, and I winked at him.' "[106]

Especial interest attaches to a final species of literary borrowing which formed part of Poe's own literary equipment. In his introduction to *Pinakidia* Poe makes reference to the various collections of "Random Thoughts" and "Odds and Ends" that were frequently appearing in the pages of periodicals and in books.

> It sometimes occurs that in papers of this nature may be found a collective mass of general, but more usually of classical erudition, which, if dextrously besprinkled over a proper surface of narrative, would be sufficient to make the fortune of one or two hundred ordinary novelists in these our good days, when all heroes and heroines are necessarily men and women of "extensive acquirements."[107]

This method of feigning erudition in fiction Poe two years later satirized in *How to Write a Blackwood Article*. As every Poe scholar

[104] *Graham's Lady's and Gentleman's Magazine*, XX: 132 (Feb. 1842).

[105] Poe is here using Smith's pseudonym in the *Letters of J. Downing, Major* (1834).

[106] *Graham's Lady's and Gentleman's Magazine*, XIX: 46-47 (July, 1841).

[107] *Southern Literary Messenger*, II: 573 (Aug. 1836).

is aware, this was a practice which Poe himself too often employed in his own tales; and one strongly suspects that the chief significance of *Pinakidia* lies in its being Poe's own literary notebook—a storehouse of learned fact and quotation at first garnered for his own use. In his prefatory remarks to *Pinakidia* Poe singles out Sterne's *Koran* and Colton's *Lacon* as works which, although published as collections of original *pensées*, were manifestly but "stolen wares."[108] But such specious learning could have a far more penetrating and pervasive influence on the author. Poe calls Harrison Ainsworth's erudition "The apparently miraculous *learning* of the plagiarist."[109]

V

Of those authors among his contemporaries whom Poe charged with imitation and plagiarism, none, as we know, so aroused his critical indignation as did Longfellow. Not that Poe failed utterly to discover genuine poetic qualities in the work of the Cambridge poet. It is hardly surprising, when we recall Poe's opinion of Margaret Fuller, that Poe should have defended Longfellow against the attacks of that lady.[110] Yet on separate occasions Poe singled out for praise both *Blind Bartimeus*[111] and *The Hymn to the Night*.[112] Longfellow, who had "remarkably succeeded in almost every other department of light literature than that of the drama,"[113] Poe did not hesitate to call "a man of true genius."[114] But with this praise, he could combine the charge of unoriginality against his contemporary. To Lowell, Poe wrote:

[108] *Ibid.*, II: 573-574 (Aug. 1836). See also *United States Magazine*, XV: 580-581 (Dec. 1844).

[109] *Graham's Lady's and Gentleman's Magazine*, XIX: 248 (Nov. 1841).

[110] *Southern Literary Messenger*, XV: 190 (Mar. 1849).

[111] *Graham's Lady's and Gentleman's Magazine*, XX: 129 (Feb. 1842). Longfellow's *Blind Bartimeus* had appeared in *Arcturus* for Dec. 1841.

[112] Letter to Lowell, dated Oct. 19, 1843 (Quinn, *op. cit.*, p. 387). See also Poe's letter to Longfellow dated May 3, 1841 (Samuel Longfellow, *Life of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow*, Boston, 1891, I: 389-390).

[113] *American Review*, II: 125 (Aug. 1845).

[114] *Ibid.*, II: 131.

Mr. Longfellow has genius, but by no means equals you in the true spirit. He is moreover so prone to imitation that I know not how to understand him at times. I am in doubt whether he should not be termed an arrant plagiarist.[115]

The source of Poe's critical antipathy to Longfellow is, of course, highly complex, reaching back into the unanalyzed recesses of Poe's mind. Naturally, his dislike of what he deemed the clannish literary pretensions of the Bostonians played its part in his numerous charges against Longfellow. "I wish you would come down on the Frogpondians," he once wrote to his friend, Thomas. "They are getting worse and worse, and pretend not to be aware that there *are* any literary people out of Boston. . . . They are decidedly the most servile imitators of the English it is possible to conceive."[116] And it is hard entirely to rule out jealousy as a subtle factor in motivating Poe's attitude. In the introductory sketch to *The Literati* Poe unhappily alludes to the influence which Longfellow could claim "as a man of property and a professor at Harvard."[117] Poe, who certainly possessed poetic aspirations of a high order, could scarcely have viewed Longfellow's popularity with unqualified pleasure. Graham, however, was not so much inclined to view these attacks on Longfellow "as the consequences of animosity or jealousy, as of the peculiar character of Poe's genius and disposition, such as his mania for prying into mysteries, and hunting out or manufacturing evidences and resemblances, . . ."[118] Yet with all the subtle and complex origins of Poe's animadversions on Longfellow, the simplest of all remains perhaps the most compelling: the esthetic realization that Longfellow often failed in essential poetic originality.

Such, in any case, is the impression derived from his earliest comments on Longfellow, before Poe had started to wage the "little Longfellow War," and had found himself under the necessity of defending his critical position. "Were it possible," he

[115] Letter dated Oct. 19, 1843. See Quinn, *op. cit.*, p. 387.

[116] *Century Magazine*, XLVIII: 864 (Oct. 1894).

[117] *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book*, XXXII: 194 (May, 1846).

[118] *Graham's Magazine*, XLIV: 222 (Feb. 1854).

asserts in reviewing *Hyperion*, "to throw into a bag the lofty thought and manner of the 'Pilgrims of the Rhine,' together with the quirks and quibbles and the true humor of 'Tristram Shandy,' not forgetting a few of the heartier drolleries of Rabelais, and one or two of the Phantasy Pieces of the Lorrainean Callôt, the whole, well shaken up, and thrown out, would be a very tolerable imitation of 'Hyperion.' "[119] Six months later came Poe's review of *Voices of the Night. The Beleaguered City* he regarded as Longfellow's "finest poem"[120]—a curious estimate of the poem in view of Poe's accusation to Griswold a year after, that Longfellow had stolen the idea of his poem from *The Haunted Palace*.[121] Poe, in this case, was apparently never sure of his critical position, and fortunately refrained from ever making the accusation public.[122] But in this same review Poe made his first direct charge against Longfellow as a plagiarist. Printing consecutively the *Midnight Mass for the Dying Year* and Tennyson's *The Death of the Old Year*, Poe remarked that he had "no idea of commenting, at any length, upon this plagiarism, which is too palpable to be mistaken; and which belongs to the most barbarous class of literary robbery; that class in which, while the words of the wronged author are avoided, his most intangible, and therefore his least defensible and least reclaimable property, is purloined."[123] Willis Gaylord Clark in the *Philadelphia Gazette*[124] called the charge "preposterous," and suggested that it be withdrawn. But Poe, then a contributor to *Alexander's Weekly Messenger*,[125] only reiterated the accusation, asserting the plagi-

[119] *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine*, V: 227 (Oct. 1839).

[120] *Ibid.*, VI: 101 (Feb. 1840).

[121] *The Literati*, p. v.

[122] Griswold in his "Memoir" tried to prove that Poe had been the thief (*The Literati*, p. xxxii-xxxiii), and even wrote Longfellow for evidence to sustain his position (Joy Bayless, *Rufus Wilmont Griswold, Poe's Literary Executor* [Nashville, Tenn., Vanderbilt University Press, 1943], pp. 195-196), but Longfellow discredited the accusation (Quinn, *op. cit.*, p. 674).

[123] *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine*, VI: 102-103 (Feb. 1840).

[124] Feb. 4, 1840.

[125] Feb. 12, 1840. See Clarence S. Brigham, *Edgar Allan Poe's Contributions to*

arism to be "bare-faced and barbarous." The alleged plagiarism in the *Midnight Mass* was to remain one of Poe's favorite pieces of evidence against Longfellow. A few years later, insisting the poem to be "one of the most singular pieces of literary Mosaic," Poe was to include among the plundered authors not only Tennyson, but Shakespeare and Milton.[126] Longfellow, in writing to a friend, denied the original imputation, declaring it "absurd," and adding that he was unaware that Tennyson had written such a poem.[127] A recent biographer of Longfellow, however, has noted that the poet had in his possession, prior to writing the *Midnight Mass,* a copy of Tennyson's *Poems* (1833) containing *The Death of the Old Year.*[128]

By the early forties Poe's attitude toward Longfellow had assumed a permanent critical pattern. Now combining insult and flattery, Poe observed in August, 1841, that "Mr. Longfellow *will* steal, but perhaps he cannot help it (for we have heard of such things,) and then it must not be denied that *nil tetigit quod non ornavit.*"[129] Poe here had probably in mind De Quincey's explanation of Coleridge's literary thefts, on the grounds of kleptomania.[130] Later in the same year, in referring to Longfellow half-humorously, half-contemptuously as "Professor of Moral Philosophy at Harvard," Poe again acknowledged that "his good qualities are all of the highest order, while his sins are chiefly those of affectation and imitation—an imitation sometimes verging on downright theft."[131]

In the review of Longfellow's *Ballads and Other Poems,* published in 1842, Poe fortunately approached his subject from a

---

Alexander's Weekly Messenger (Worcester, American Antiquarian Society, 1943), pp. 33-35.

[126] *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book*, XXXI: 120 (Sept. 1845).

[127] Lawrance Thompson, *Young Longfellow (1807-1843)* (New York, The Macmillan Co., 1938), p. 416.

[128] *Ibid.*, pp. 413-414; 416.

[129] *Graham's Lady's and Gentleman's Magazine*, XIX: 92 (Aug. 1841).

[130] *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine*, I (N.S.): 318-319 (Sept. 1834).

[131] *Graham's Lady's and Gentleman's Magazine*, XIX: 229 (Nov. 1841).

more aesthetic angle. In this critique, from which we have already had occasion to quote, Poe decries a purely imitative art. The "mere *record*" of lovely form, color, and sound may be a source of delight, but "this repetition is not Poesy." From "*novel* combinations among these forms of beauty" the poet must create a transcendent loveliness. And in this Longfellow had too often failed:

> In common with all who claim the sacred title of poet, he should limit his endeavors to the creation of novel moods of beauty, in form, in color, in sound, in sentiment; for over all this range has the poetry of words dominion. To what the world terms *prose* may be safely and properly left all else.[132]

Thus Longfellow, instead of creating "novel moods of beauty," had done what other poets had done before him, elaborating on the old themes in the good old way, resorting to poetic sentiments long since faded, yet still beloved by his bourgeois audience. Doubtless the reader of this review will discover much that sheds light on other phases of Poe's esthetics, but for us it serves especially to italicize the principle to which this paper has in part been dedicated—that, despite his erratic and unfair charges against his contemporaries, Poe in essence was not so much concerned with the narrow problem of plagiarism, as with broader critical and esthetic principles, to which, in this case, Poe believed that Longfellow had often failed to conform.

Yet it is hard not to confess that the complexity of Poe's views on the Cambridge poet at times quite defies interpretation. As Graham so well noted, Poe, in the detection of plagiarism, was following a lure which found a perfect response in the man's subtly analytical mind. Unhappily, the more Poe fancied he discerned traces of imitation in Longfellow, the keener became his desire to lay bare before the world what he believed the essential weaknesses of the poets. And in the capricious workings of Poe's mind little distinction often remained between a sin against art and beauty, and a sin which consisted in downright theft. Thus a

[132] *Ibid.*, XX: 248-250 (Apr. 1842).

year after the publication of Poe's review of *Ballads and Other Poems*, Poe prepared a review of Longfellow's *Spanish Student*. George Graham, eager to have Longfellow as a regular contributor,[133] had already printed a number of his works, including the serialized version of *The Spanish Student* (1842), which, the following year, was issued in book-form. The nature of Poe's review (not now extant) is probably best understood by reference to a passage in a letter which Poe wrote, July 2, 1844, to Lowell.

> Graham has had, for nine months, a review of mine on Longfellow's "Spanish Student," which I have used up, and in which I have exposed some of the grossest plagiarisms ever perpetrated.

And Poe naïvely adds: "I can't tell why he does not publish it."[134] But Graham's reason for holding the review is not far to seek. That Graham was trying to protect Longfellow, and had no intention of publishing the review is clearly revealed in a letter which Graham addressed to Longfellow on March 11, 1845:

> . . . What has "broke loose" in Poe? I see he is down on you in New York papers and has written demanding return of Review I mentioned he had written for me. If he sends money or another article I shall be obliged to let him have it. . .[135]

The substance of this review Poe may later have incorporated in his reply to "Outis," where, however, the alleged plagiarisms are hardly demonstrated as gross.

Only slight encouragement is sometimes needed to perpetuate the perverse inclinations of the human mind. A number of coincidences now afforded Poe such an encouragement, and eventually helped, I believe, to stimulate the "little Longfellow war." It should be recalled that the *Foreign Quarterly Review* for January, 1844, contained an article on American poetry, probably by John Forster. We have already quoted from this critique in an effort

[133] Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 324.

[134] See Quinn, *op. cit.*, p. 430.

[135] Mary Elizabeth Phillips, *Edgar Allan Poe, the Man* (Philadelphia, John C. Winston Co., 1926), II: 978.

to show that Poe may have derived from it aliment for the one absorbing critical passion in his life. According to Forster, the Americans are especially prone to imitation and plagiary. One finds it in John Pierpont; one discovers it in Edgar Poe. Here was an English critic on the trail of the American poet—the very trail which Poe himself had for years been following with no little personal satisfaction. Surely he could now take courage! Then again, Poe was not alone in detecting the literary sins of Longfellow. Probably sometime in December, 1842, Longfellow had sent to *Graham's Magazine* verses entitled *The Good George Campbell, From the German of O. L. B. Wolff*. Griswold, then editor of *Graham's*, wrote to Longfellow pointing out that the poem was in reality an old Scotch ballad. Longfellow explained to Griswold that Wolff had certainly translated the poem from the English, and given it to the public as his own.[136] Notwithstanding the explanation, the poem was allowed to appear in *Graham's* for February, 1843. Two years later, the *Western Literary Messenger*, a Buffalo magazine, in the issue for January 25, 1845, printed a communication from "Pi Kappa Rho," charging Longfellow with having passed off an old Scottish ballad in Motherwell's *Minstrelsy, Ancient and Modern* as a translation from the German.

> Had Mr. Longfellow added to its beauty [observes the writer], he would, at least, not have been chargeable with an offence against good taste; but in this instance we are not only to blush for a gross plagiarism in an American poet, but also for the degrading opinion he must have of us, his countrymen, in supposing that he can, undetected, palm off upon us, in a mutilated state, this fragment of a beautiful ancient Scottish song, as a translation from the German of O. L. B. Wolf [*sic*].

The editor of the *Messenger*, visibly impressed by his correspondent's accusation of the Cambridge poet, ventured in the same issue to observe that Longfellow had been placed in "an unenviable position."

[136] Bayless, *op. cit.*, p. 58-59.

Mr. Longfellow stands convicted of a most unblushing plagairism [*sic*], unless he can show that the thieving was done by Wolf, from whom he professes to translate. In that case, it will seem somewhat remarkable that a poet of Mr. Longfellow's reputation and research should not have been acquainted with this fragment of a Scottish song that has been so generally admired,—to say nothing of the close resemblance in style and diction between the two pieces, as given by our correspondent.

This accusation might have passed unnoticed by Poe had it not been specifically pointed out to the readers of the New York *Rover*[137] while the "little Longfellow war" was in full swing. The editor of the *Rover*, now relying on charges against Longfellow which Poe was then making in Willis's *Evening Mirror*, boldly interpreted the assertions in the *Messenger* in terms of unscrupulous plagiarism.

H. W. Longfellow.—A writer in the Western Literary Messenger has recently detected this gentleman in one of the most flagrant and unscrupulous pieces of plagiarism that ever occurred in our literature. In a critique upon his "Waif," in the Evening Mirror, a covert allusion was made to a disposition on the part of the "Professor" to thrive upon the hard-earned laurels of others, and the only fault of Willis's article was, that he merely hit the nail's head which this gentleman firmly clinches in the following two lyrics.

The editor then printed in parallel columns the Scottish ballad and Longfellow's translation from Wolff, concluding with the sarcastic comment, "Singular *coincidence*, eh?" This saucy allegation elicited widespread notice in the New York papers, especially in the *Tribune*[138] and the *Broadway Journal*.[139] What a delight all this must have been to Poe, now in the thick of the fight! But let us return to the beginning of the war.

It all started with Poe's review, in the *Evening Mirror* for January 13, 14, 1845, of Longfellow's slender anthology, entitled *The Waif*. To the opening poem, by Longfellow himself, Poe accorded high praise. But he could not refrain, at the same time,

[137] Feb. 8, 1845.
[138] Feb. 14, 1845.
[139] I: 109 (Feb. 15, 1845).

from making an invidious insinuation regarding Longfellow's honesty. There appears "in this exquisite little volume," notes Poe, "a very careful avoidance of all American poets who may be supposed especially to interfere with the claims of Mr. Longfellow. These men Mr. Longfellow can continuously *imitate* (*is* that the word?) and yet never even incidentally commend."[140] Naturally this gratuitous remark was ill-calculated to please Longfellow's friends and admirers. In the same review Poe also quoted from *The Waif* Hood's verses *The Death-Bed*, which he compared with James Aldrich's *A Death-Bed*, adding the assertion that somebody is a *thief*. The tone of the entire review was certainly such as to arouse controversy. Soon a friend of Longfellow's from Boston, signing himself "H," wrote to Willis: "This is no light accusation; and is one against which his friends feel bound to enter their most emphatic protest."[141] Presently a second friend came to Longfellow's defense.[142] In printing this defense, Willis took occasion quietly to suggest his own disapproval of Poe's accusations. But Graham, who, as we have seen, had sought to protect Longfellow's interests, induced Willis to write a more positive disclaimer of Poe's charges.[143] So "to gratify a friend," the good-hearted Willis now asserted that he did not personally countenance "*all* the disparagement of Longfellow."[144]

Although Willis, it appears, was perfectly sincere in his statements, after Poe's death, that there had been no serious friction between himself and Poe while the latter was engaged on the *Mirror* as a paragraphist, yet it is inconceivable that there was no disturbance whatever in the editorial offices of the paper. The pa-

[140] *Evening Mirror*, Jan. 14, 1845.

[141] *Ibid.*, Jan. 20, 1845.

[142] *Ibid.*, Feb. 5, 1845.

[143] In writing to Longfellow on Mar. 11, 1845, Graham remarked, "Mr. Willis made a disclaimer of being an endorser of Poe's views, at my request." See Phillips, *op. cit.*, II: 978.

[144] *Evening Mirror*, Feb. 14, 1845.

tient Willis could scarcely have approved Poe's next defense of his position. But Poe, probably under orders from Willis, was now more cautious. Neither Longfellow nor Aldrich was personally mentioned in an editorial entitled "Imitation-Plagiarism."[145] Apparently having in mind the article on American poets in the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, Poe observed, "The British reviewers have very frequently accused us of imitation, and the charge is undoubtedly well based. . . . All colonies have shown a proneness to ape the mother country in arts and letters." As the editorial advances, however, more pointed allusion is made to Longfellow. In his prefatory note to *The Literati*, Poe was to refer to the poet as "a man of property and a professor at Harvard." Poe now asserts,

> Our sole writers, . . . are from the class of *dilettanti*; and although among this class are unquestionably many gifted men, still as a class—as men of wealth and leisure—they are imbued with a spirit of conservatism, which is merely a mood of the imitative spirit. But apart from this consideration, we must observe that to imitate is a matter of less effort than to originate; and we must not expect effort as a general thing, certainly not as a continuous thing, from those whose condition is affluence and else.

As for plagiarism, "individuals among us have not been altogether sinless." And he adds, "The sin of plagiarism involves the quintessence of meanness; and this meanness seems in direct ratio of the amount of *honor* attained by the theft." The application to Longfellow once again becomes evident when we recall that his friends had been writing to Willis in his defense. Poe continues,

> When a plagiarism is detected, it generally happens that the public sympathy is with the plagiarist, and his friends proceed to every extreme in the way of exculpation. But how unjust! . . . In detecting a literary theft, it usually happens that we know only the *fact of a theft committed*. Seldom are we in condition to determine who perpetrates the wrong. And if the wrong be perpetrated by a man of note—so much more reprehensible is it, on the ground that where a question such as we have imagined occurs, it is always sure to be taken for granted that the sin is chargeable on the innocent unknown.

[145] *Ibid.*, Feb. 15, 1845.

It is hardly too much to believe that Willis' patience was by now nearly exhausted. But he allowed Poe one more fling. Charles Briggs, editor of the *Broadway Journal*, objected to Poe's insinuation that Aldrich had plundered Hood. "We can discover no resemblance between these verses, sufficient to warrant the charge of plagiarism, . . ." Briggs declared. And he tried to show (which was erroneous) that Aldrich's verses had preceded Hood's. Briggs then alluded unfavorably to the charge made by the *Rover* against Longfellow.[146] Poe's reply in the *Mirror* included *ten* reasons for believing that the verses involved plagiarism, and added, "We repeat that 'somebody *is* a thief,' and the only doubt in our mind is about the sincerity of anyone who shall say that somebody is *not*."[147]

By February 22,[148] Poe had probably retired from the *Mirror*, and was soon to become an editor of the *Broadway Journal*. Willis years later wrote that he had parted with Poe reluctantly.[149] And Willis, always a genial, fair-minded man, must truly have appreciated Poe's editorial and critical powers. Indeed, before Poe's retirement, Willis had praised his assistant's capacities as a magazine editor, but pointed out that Poe was "ready . . . for propositions."[150] It can hardly be doubted that Poe must have regarded his job on the *Mirror* as simply a stop-gap. But he had made the most of this happy interlude to render the name of Poe a thing to be feared (if not respected) in critical circles. I fancy that the long-suffering Willis had at last made it clear to his sub-editor that his attacks upon his fellow authors *must* cease. And Poe, now ready for what he deemed something better, retired from the *Mirror*.

Toward the end of February Poe, for a moment, carried the war to the lecture platform. The *Tribune* reported "a remarkable

[146] *Broadway Journal*, I: 109 (Feb. 15, 1845).

[147] *Evening Mirror*, Feb. 17, 1845.

[148] *The Broadway Journal* (I: 127) of that date notes that Poe will soon be associated with the editorial department of that paper.

[149] *Home Journal*, Oct. 30, 1858.

[150] *Evening Mirror*, Jan. 20, 1845.

Lecture on American Poets and Poetry" delivered at the Society Library, but objected to Poe's "broad assertion that Longfellow is a plagiarist. Of all critical cant, this hunting after coincidence of idea or phrase, often unavoidable, between authors, is the least endurable."[151]

But Poe's critical sword could best be wielded in the field of journalism, and his new connection with the *Broadway Journal* afforded him a new freedom. And assuredly he needed this freedom, for Longfellow's friends were not yet done. One "Outis"[152] presently wrote a letter of protest to Willis.[153] In this clever piece of critical writing, Outis asks, "What *is* plagiarism?" And he seeks to show the possibility of "identities" without plagiarism, where two passages or poems by different authors spring independently from a similar concrete experience. This fact, Outis believes, probably accounts for what similarities may exist between Hood's and Aldrich's verses. "And now—for the matter of Longfellow's imitations—In what do they consist?" Here Outis thinks "The critic is not very specific in this charge," and, after a few words he turns to some poetic illustrations which he believes demonstrate identity without plagiarism. In answering Briggs, it will be recalled, Poe had noted ten points of resemblance between the poems of Hood and Aldrich. Outis now compares three *disconnected* stanzas from an anonymous poem *The Bird of the Dream* and Poe's *Raven.* He confesses that Poe had probably never heard of *The Bird of the Dream;* hence there could certainly be no plagiarism. But Outis proceeds to note fifteen specific points of similarity between the two poems.

[151] *New York Daily Tribune,* Mar. 1, 1845.

[152] Miss Mary Phillips (*op. cit.,* II: 956 ff) expresses the belief that "Outis" was Poe himself. The article would thus have been written as a hoax to give himself greater notoriety, and to afford himself a point of departure in his final attack on Longfellow. As the late Killis Campbell has pointed out, however, there is more than one reason for denying such an assumption. Professor Campbell believed "Outis" may have been Longfellow's intimate friend, Cornelius Felton of Harvard. See *Who Was Outis* in: *Studies in English—University of Texas Bulletin,* VIII: 107-109 (1928). For other attempts to identify "Outis," see Phillips, *op. cit.,* II: 972-973.

[153] *Evening Mirror,* Mar. 1, 1845.

Poe's reply consisted in a series of five articles, published in the *Broadway Journal*. The first had the pretentious caption: *Imitation-Plagiarism—Mr. Poe's Reply to the Letter of Outis—A Large Account of a Small Matter—A Voluminous History of the Little Longfellow War*.[154] Poe first gave a history of the war to date, starting with the firing of the first gun in his own review of *The Waif* and concluding with the complete text of Outis' assault. Poe's counterattack follows. For a considerable space Poe treats Outis to a singular display of jocularity, in which irrelevancy and sheer bad taste are especially conspicuous. While in this sportive vein, Poe contends that Outis had denied the very existence of such a thing as plagiarism.[155] But anon Poe begins to develop more seriously and concretely his disagreement with Outis. A few points only must suffice. Either purposely or inadvertently, Poe insists that Outis is charging him with plagiarism. Outis had, of course, avoided any charge of this sort, but had nevertheless somewhat laid himself open to attack. As Poe rightly notes, Outis had forced similarities between *The Raven* and the poems he had used for comparison, so that he became an easy prey to Poe's ratiocinative power.[156]

Finally coming to Longfellow, after undue discursiveness, Poe leaves the literary realm mapped out by Outis, and enumerates a number of specific instances (as he insists) of plagiarism perpetrated by the Cambridge poet. The first involves *Midnight Mass of the Dying Year* and *The Death of the Old Year*, noted some years before in *Graham's*. The second concerns the alleged theft of Longfellow from Motherwell. The third pertains to a scene in Longfellow's *The Spanish Student*, which, Poe declares, has been imitated from his own *Politian*! This was an unhappy accusation since both plays derive, in part at least, from the Elizabethan drama. Finally, Poe presents a number of minor parallels indicative of imitation or theft, and adds:

[154] *Broadway Journal*, I: 147 (Mar. 8, 1845).
[155] *Ibid.*, I: 161-162 (Mar. 15, 1845).
[156] *Ibid.*, I: 178-182 (Mar. 22, 1845).

> The fact of the matter is, that the friends of Mr. Longfellow, so far from undertaking to talk about my "carping littleness" in charging Mr. Longfellow with imitation, should have given me credit, under the circumstances, for great moderation in charging him with imitation alone. Had I accused him, in loud terms, of manifest and continuous plagiarism, I should but have echoed the sentiment of every man of letters in the land beyond the immediate influence of the Longfellow coterie.[157]

Earlier in this series of articles, Poe had declared himself a "man with a soul that bids him come out from among the general corruption of our public press, and take his stand upon the open ground of rectitude and honor."[158] And later he explains,

> . . . my design has been to place fairly and distinctly before the literary public certain principles of criticism for which I have long been contending, . . . The thesis of my argument, in general, has been the definition of the grounds on which a charge of plagiarism may be based, and of the species of ratiocination by which it is to be established: this is all.[159]

Yet in insisting on this group of articles as a series of laboratory experiments to determine "the grounds on which a charge of plagiarism may be based," Poe makes far too great a claim. For only in analyzing what he insists are Outis' accusations against himself does he, in any measure at all, achieve the distinction of establishing *principles*. For the most part what remains is the product of singularity and whim. And fortunately Poe, I believe, in the end became aware of how inconclusive was the evidence he had sought to adduce. In his fifth and last installment, he cautiously seeks to make some amends to Longfellow. He remarks, "It will be seen by any one who shall take the trouble to read what I have written, that I make *no* charge of moral delinquency against either Mr. Longfellow, Mr. Aldrich, or Mr. Hood: . . ." One reads this disclaimer with relief, yet never fully convinced of its sincerity. Further to palliate the possible moral implication of his earlier remarks, Poe endeavors to show that the *great poet*, peculiarly

[157] *Ibid.*, I: 194-198 (Mar. 28, 1845).
[158] *Ibid.*, I: 194.
[159] *Ibid.*, I: 211 (Apr. 5, 1845).

sensitive to poetic ideas and figures encountered in his reading, inevitably, after a long period of time, unconsciously reflects the same ideas and figures in his own poetry. And that is why "all literary history demonstrates that, for the most frequent and palpable plagiarisms, we must search the works of the most eminent poets."[160] Be all this as it may, except for some light skirmishing, which we shall note in a moment, the "little Longfellow war" was over.

In writing to J. Hunt, editor of the *National Archives* of Ithaca, Poe pointed out that this was the first time he had "ever replied, directly or indirectly, to any strictures, personal or literary," but he declared an answer had now become imperative.[161] His partner, Charles Briggs, who remarked that the war was "all on one side," wrote to Lowell that he was inclined to let Poe have his fling.[162] "It will end as it began, in smoke."[163] Lowell himself had deemed offensive some of the things Poe had said regarding Longfellow, but Briggs insisted that Poe really had a "very high admiration for Longfellow, and so he will say before he is done."[164]

Longfellow spoke only once in his own behalf, and then not directly in reply to Poe. Longfellow was visibly disturbed by the charge of plagiarism in *The Good George Campbell,* originally made by some anonymous person. On February 19, 1845, he wrote to Graham explaining how he had come to translate the ballad from Wolff, and requesting that Graham publish the letter.[165] For some reason, the letter did not appear until the May issue of *Graham's.* In the meantime, Poe had incorporated the charge in his reply to Outis. Longfellow's letter, then, served as a partial answer to Poe, although it was not so intended. Friedrich Spielhagen, who in 1882 wrote a series of articles regarding

[160] *Ibid.,* I: 211-212.

[161] Letter dated Mar. 17, 1845. See *Century Magazine,* LXV: 550 (Feb., 1903).

[162] Letter dated Mar. 8, 1845. See Woodberry, *op. cit.,* II: 126.

[163] Letter dated Mar. 16, 1845. See Woodberry, *op. cit.,* II: 127.

[164] Letter dated Mar. 19, 1845. See Woodberry, *op. cit.,* II: 128.

[165] *Graham's American Monthly Magazine,* XXVI: 240 (May, 1845).

Poe's attacks on Longfellow, raised the question whether the character of Hathaway in Longfellow's *Kavanagh,* published shortly before Poe's death, may not have been suggested by Poe.[166] Hathaway in his ambition to establish "a new Magazine," "in order to raise the character of American literature, which, in his opinion, the existing reviews and magazines had entirely failed to accomplish,"[167] certainly brings to mind Poe. Hathaway's insistence on the importance of originality, and his belief that American authors imitate too closely their cousins again substantiates the Poe origin of Longfellow's character. But Hathaway, who possesses none of Poe's esthetic proclivities, in one place insists upon associating originality with the untutored, wild, and free.

For a year and a half, following the conclusion of the Longfellow war, Poe fired an occasional shot. Longfellow's lines *Rain in Summer* had appeared in *Graham's* for August, 1845. Poe at once expressed a belief that the poem smacked of Bryant's *Evening Wind.*[168] But by the following week he had shifted his position, and printed Longfellow's same verses along with Elizabeth Oakes Smith's *The Water* with the comment: "If this is *not* plagiarism, and a very bold one, on the part of Professor Longfellow, will anybody be kind enough to tell us what it *is*?"[169] At this time Poe also contributed to the *American Review* a critical essay on *The American Drama,*[170] which included numerous comments on the drama as a mimetic art, and which contained an analysis of *The Spanish Student.* How much of the article duplicated the one which Graham had refused to print would be impossible to say. In any

[166] Friedrich Spielhagen, *Edgar Poe gegen Henry Longfellow,* in: *Westermanns Illustrierte Deutsche Monats-Hefte,* LIII: 124 (Oktober, 1882).

[167] Longfellow, *Kavanagh, A Tale* (Boston, 1849), 112-113.

[168] *Broadway Journal,* II: 89 (Aug. 16, 1845).

[169] *Ibid.,* II: 103 (Aug. 23, 1845).

[170] *American Review,* II: 117-131 (Aug. 1845). Professor Quinn believes that Poe probably had a hand in two reviews which appeared in Thomas Dunn English's *Aristidean,* and which contain slurs on Longfellow, as well as charges of plagiarism. The second of these appeared as late as October, 1845. See Quinn, *op. cit.,* pp. 467, 474.

event, Poe fortunately did not repeat the charge, made in his reply to Outis, that Longfellow had imitated a scene from *Politian*. Instead, he chose, as his critical objective, to demonstrate the lack of originality in the play. Having established three points necessary to auctorial originality (these we have earlier noted), he shows wherein Longfellow had failed in each. This analysis presents Poe in his best light as a critic, and illustrates, with unusual precision, the essential weaknesses of Longfellow's play.

It was, indeed, hard for Poe to drop a subject which had for so long preoccupied his mind. The following year, as we have already seen, he included in the introduction to his *Literati* series comment most uncomplimentary to Longfellow. And at the close of the same year, while Virginia was dying, and himself seriously ill, he evidently contemplated another thrust at Longfellow. Writing to Duyckinck, Poe recalled that the New York editor had, but a year ago, shown him "some English stanzas—by a lady I think, from the rhythm of which Longfellow imitated the rhythm of the Proem of his 'Waif.' " Would Duyckinck let him see the poem again?[171]

Despite his silence, Longfellow may have taken somewhat to heart the attacks of Poe. In 1846, while reading one of Brainard's poems, Longfellow chanced upon a line that recalled a verse in his own *Excelsior*. He consoled himself with the reflection:

> Of a truth, one cannot strike a spade into the soil of Parnassus, without disturbing the bones of some dead poet.[172]

And in this reflection Poe, as we have seen, had in part concurred. Yet few will be likely to dissent from Poe's conviction that too often to disturb the bones of some dead poet is inevitably to invite the charge of unoriginality. It is worth recording that directly after Poe's death, this charge, in some quarters, continued to be made. "Those who are familiar with the writings of Jean Paul,"

[171] Letter dated Dec. 24, 1846. See *Complete Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, edited by James A. Harrison (New York, Thomas J. Crowell Co., 1902), XVII: 273.

[172] Samuel Longfellow, *op. cit.*, II: 66.

noted the *Dublin University Magazine* in commenting on *The Psalm of Life*, "will be at no loss to recognize the source of many of the ideas contained in this piece. The coincidence is so remarkable that we shall add the parrallel [*sic*] passage—the prose of which is almost as poetical as the melodious verses of Longfellow."[173] So, too, in reviewing *The Golden Legend*, a critic in *Blackwood's* acknowledged the "many exquisite passages" contained in the drama, but pointed to "its manifest resemblance to the *Faust*." And the same reviewer added, quite in the manner of Poe, that "it must be confessed that Mr. Longfellow does not possess the art of disguising stolen goods. . . . No man can read six pages of *The Golden Legend*, without being reminded of the *Faust*, and that so strongly that there is a perpetual challenge of comparison."[174]

Had Poe's critical arrow, in the final analysis, fallen too wide of the mark? Not certainly in the opinion of the present writer. Longfellow's desire, however laudable, to strike a responsive chord in the heart of the common man—an impulse so beautifully expressed in the "Dedication" to *Seaside and Fireside*—had frequently led the poet to speak those thoughts and voice those emotions which he *knew* his readers cherished. And what was this impulse but what Poe in his better critical moments recognized as imitation? In all truth, Poe knew better than to believe that Longfellow had been guilty of literary theft, and Poe's charges, it must be acknowledged, were too often lacking in common sense and charity; yet he knew, as critics are today aware, that the Cambridge poet's lapses in originality are too conspicuous ever to be completely ignored. These lapses, one should hasten to say, are not the whole of Longfellow, and Poe recognized this fact too.

[173] XXXV: 463 (Apr. 1850).
[174] LXXI: 215 (Feb. 1852).

Certain Basic Problems in Descriptive Bibliography[1]

By Fredson Bowers

WHEN one approaches the subject of problems in descriptive bibliography, especially for early books, the realization of all there is to discuss is so overwhelming that where to begin is doubtful and—once launched—there could scarcely be a final word. It is no mean feat to formulate a basic system for describing books which is logical, consistent, and sufficiently precise in details to satisfy the requirements of various kinds of readers—one which is tailored to make the most of the particular characteristics of the group of books being described, and yet a method so comprehensive that constant exceptions and modifications need not be made to deal with the abnormalities of structure or content which inevitably crop up in any large lot of early books. But interesting and important as is this problem of the basic theory of a bibliographical description, especially as applied to books of different kinds and periods, there is yet an underlying set of problems which must be solved if the printed description is not to be an empty façade, or—if a sound structure—is not to have been built at a quite exorbitant expenditure of time and labor. These are properly the problems of descriptive bibliography, and may be differentiated from the more narrowly technical problems of bibliographical description.

Certain of these difficulties have not ordinarily been brought

[1] Revised from a paper read before the annual meeting of the Bibliographical Society of America at Philadelphia, June 5, 1948.

to the attention of students proposing to compile[2] a descriptive bibliography, and they can be but dimly glimpsed, if at all, by the ordinary reader of the printed result. Yet until a method has been devised for overcoming them, a bibliographer may find under some circumstances that he has been wasting his time in a prodigal manner in examining books for a description without having achieved properly definitive results.

These problems concern themselves first with the standards of examination which the writer of a descriptive bibliography should propose for himself, and then with the practical means by which he may, in an efficient manner, fulfill these standards. This is the *what, where,* and *how* of the necessary comparison of copies, and until these three questions are answered, there is little point in progressing to theories treating the construction of the end-result, the description itself.

It must be understood that I am proposing to discuss not a catalogue, or a checklist, virtuous as these are, or some other form of enumerative bibliography, but instead a work of large-scale descriptive bibliography, of which the best example in our times is certainly W. W. Greg's monumental *A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration* (London, Printed for the Bibliographical Society at the University Press, Oxford, 1939—). Such a work involves a large number of titles by many authors, its purpose being to compare considerable numbers of duplicate copies of each edition in order to establish definitively the ideal form of that edition, with its issues and variant states in all their precisely differentiated multiplicity, described, technically, in complete detail. Moreover, I am not envisaging a professional full-time bibliographer supported by a foundation or by the wise provision of his forefathers, but instead the more common case of a

[2] Actually, I object to this word *compile* as applied, conventionally, to descriptive bibliography, since it connotes a mechanical process of assembling material which is far distant from the creative analysis which actually goes into the completed description of many a book. Perhaps we can *compile* enumerative but *write* descriptive bibliographies.

normally indigent professional scholar in a university or library, or a trained amateur, who engages in bibliography as a well-defined research project interwoven with other necessary duties. Finally, I confine myself for practical illustration to bibliography in the period of hand-printing from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries, simply because I am more familiar with this field than with others, although I hope my generalizations may have a somewhat wider application in part. And since one speaks best of what is personal experience, I shall use, as a kind of case-history, problems I have encountered in just such a bibliography as I propose to discuss: post-Restoration plays between 1660 and 1700, a work now in its third year of preparation.

My primary statement, therefore, is not about the technical difficulties of writing an ideal bibliographical description, but rather a running account of what I feel is entailed by work in the early periods when attempted according to standards which should be expected in descriptive bibliography, and the problems which one encounters in trying to meet these standards. For the purpose only of offering some figures which are typical for bibliographies concerned with a popular type of English literature, I cite the conditions of my projected bibliography of Restoration plays, a work which will treat close to seven hundred titles existing in about eleven to twelve hundred editions, with a correspondingly large number of issues and many, many variant states.[3] Clearly, dealing with such a mass of material constitutes in itself a serious problem, first for getting at such a great number of books, and, second, for evolving methods for the proper bibliographical comparison of duplicate copies.[4]

[3] This figure would have been materially raised had I not decided to drop personal examination of post-Restoration editions or issues of Elizabethan plays, which will have been fully described by Greg, thus contenting myself with appropriate headings for these and the simple references to the assigned numbers of Greg's listing.

[4] Almost inevitably, any large-scale bibliography of this nature must start from the basis of a checklist or catalogue already in existence, and I am fortunate in having available the excellent *Checklist of English Plays, 1641-1700* by Gertrude Woodward and James G. McManaway (Chicago, The Newberry Library, 1945). On the

For a real descriptive bibliography of early books, and one worthy the name of descriptive bibliography,[5] the first ques-

other hand, this problem is acute for any descriptive bibliographer, who, as Greg was forced to do, must first spend several years or more discovering and assembling all the raw material for his project before entering upon his proper duties of comparing and analyzing copies for the purposes of bibliographical description. The basic problem here is not so much the discovery of unknown editions of known titles as of the turning up of titles and authors previously unrecorded in accounts of the type or period of literature one has selected. One can scarcely go to the Union Catalogue and demand a list of all plays published between 1660 and 1700! On the other hand, the Catalogue could supply the basis, even though incomplete, for a list of known authors or titles submitted to it. At the present moment, however, the records of holdings are still too limited to provide the bibliographer with the location of all the duplicate copies he will require. Once we write bibliographies outside the well-organized STC field, our troubles begin, although the completion of Wing's catalogue will make things much easier up to 1700. When shall we ever know anything precise about books printed in the eighteenth century?

[5] In my opinion a work can be called a descriptive bibliography only if it is based on the first-hand comparison by the investigator himself of large numbers of duplicates so that for all practical purposes the possibility for variation in the physical makeup of the book or in the evidence for its conditions of publication and subsequent sale has been exhausted. The evidence of this large-scale comparison is thereupon analyzed, ordered, and set down in such technical bibliographical detail that what can be determined of the printing and publishing history of the book and its contents is fully revealed. Moreover, as much as possible, the bibliographical detail should be so complete as to enable a reader comparing the printed description with a copy of the book in his possession to determine with precision the precise state, issue, and edition which he is holding. In addition, one might hope that the detail selected for the description would be such that minor variants not present in the copies seen by the bibliographer could often be detected by a close checking of the variant book against the description. It seems to me that a true descriptive bibliography develops a triple purpose: to furnish a detailed, analytical record of the physical characteristics of a book, which serves simultaneously as a trustworthy source of identification and also—equally important—as a medium to bring an absent book before the reader's eyes; to provide an analytical investigation and an ordered account of the physical facts, which will serve as the prerequisite for textual criticism of the books described; to approach both literary and publishing history through the investigation and recording of appropriate details in a related series of books. Thus I take it that the primary end of descriptive bibliography is *the formulary description of a series of books within a unified subject so that the relations of their texts are clarified and the method of printing and publication of all forms of each volume is determined.* A work describing books which does not fulfill the necessary standards either in the number of copies directly compared or in the bibliographical method used to describe the details (as well as in the amount of detail furnished), I prefer to differentiate as a *bibliographical catalogue.* In sober truth, there have been few true descriptive bibliographies written, although the number would be somewhat increased if one's standards required only a definitive account of the makeup, and the title-page or structural evidence of the publishing history of a book, without the additional requirement that every internal printing variant not affecting makeup (press-correction from proof excepted, of course) had been determined.

tion is: what constitutes a definitive examination of a book. Of course, the only truly definitive examination would take in every copy printed. This being an impossible condition, the ideal would be to examine every extant copy; but in some fields the books are too common for this to be at all times practicable for large-scale work. Hence, it would seem possible to construct an artificial standard by which one would engage oneself to examine personally between fifteen and twenty copies of each first, or substantive, edition, and between ten and fifteen of later non-substantive editions, unless special features developed in either to call for more extensive scrutiny. Since—to take my own project as an example—this proposal will involve a page by page comparison of about fifteen thousand books altogether, it would seem that something close to the limit of human endurance had been reached. Yet, even so, a very large element of chance remains. This figure represents only about one to two per cent of the originally printed copies of any edition. That other ninety-eight per cent, which no large-scale bibliographer can ever personally survey, is a constant nightmare.

Is it possible to extend one's authority into this vast no-man's-land by invoking the assistance of others? Without genuine, equal collaboration, I think not, at least not with such definitive results as one might venture to guarantee for personally examined copies. And even in true collaboration there are inherent difficulties to work of the highest standards. For the lone bibliographer there remains a course of action which has frequently been taken. This is to secure title photostats or transcripts from all known copies one will not be able to see oneself, and then to supplement them by enquiries to these libraries to establish that the format and collation of the copies corresponds to the stated norm, with special requests for notes on variant features like errors or corrections in pagination, signature numbering, heading material, and so on. Although this procedure establishes that the copies so treated con-

form in their issue and general printing history, it does not and cannot establish that internally every copy in this category is like every other copy in all details of its typesetting. Moreover, unremarkable internal cancellation and substitution, or resetting of sheets to stretch an edition, as well as variants of all sorts which have not been specifically queried, can seldom be discovered.

Hence, under the best of circumstances, such an extension of the number of copies surveyed can be of much use only as a partial supplement to an already established wide base of copies personally compared. Since one can guarantee that these last are similar even in details not described, but no such guarantees except for certain specific details can be made about reported copies,[6] it seems impossible to consider the two levels of examination as sufficiently equal even to justify listing all copies together on the same footing without clear differentiation as to the degree of examination. It is all the more impossible to feel that such a partial investigation of copies can be admitted as a substitute to fill up the suitable number which should have been personally and directly compared.[7]

[6] In addition, there is always the hazard of inaccurate reporting. Not every library has a trained analytical bibliographer on its staff who is competent to answer some questions involving the rigorous bibliographical analysis of a book. I have known a number of instances of manifest end-papers reported as genuine original blank leaves, failures to recognize the stigmata of cancellation and substitution, and so on. The bibliography assimilated in the usual library school course is of a different nature from the training necessary to answer with exactness the numerous questions which a descriptive bibliographer has to ask.

[7] Another possibility is to persuade an interested library to check a carbon of one's typescript of descriptions, or else the proof sheets, point by point against the corresponding details of its holdings. When performed carefully and competently, this checking guarantees what the other method of survey fails to do, that such and such supplementary copies conform in their physical characteristics to those details of the description provided. Superior as is this method, it can rarely be invoked except in specific cases, for few great collections could spare a skilled bibliographer for such a task, considering the extraordinary time it would take for many entries. Hence this system for employing outside assistance cannot materially extend the number of copies surveyed of the general run of one's books, it is dependent for its effectiveness on the trust that can be placed in the examiner, and, again, it cannot guarantee complete identity of typesetting—and sometimes of contents—of every part of every book so checked, as should be taken for granted when a bibliographer himself makes a direct comparison of two or more duplicate copies. Hence, for the basic list of

Next, what principles are we to use for the selection of the copies to examine? The question of an international record first arises. Ideally, any descriptive bibliography of English literature should be an international survey of holdings, but we must recognize that it is easier for an American to list copies in England than it is for an English bibliographer to make an equivalent examination of American copies. The very considerable concentration of rare book collections within a relatively short radius of London means that at an expense not prohibitively greater than is involved in travelling from the East to the West Coast of the United States, the American bibliographer can find available a wealth of duplicates and rare originals which could be matched in this country only if any four or five names such as Harvard, Yale, Texas, Newberry, Library of Congress, Folger, and Huntington were within an hour and a half train trip. To equal these English resources in America, an English bibliographer would need to travel some thousands of miles among our collections. As a consequence, English bibliographies—perhaps less often subsidized by grants—ordinarily omit, for reasons that can be understood, mention of American copies except from what can be determined by correspondence or other assistance here. The considerable distances between notable American collections has an inhibiting effect on our bibliographers, as well, a point to which I shall revert; I speak of it here only to develop the argument that, because of certain fixed conditions, a bibliography written by an American—on the Eastern seaboard at least—can normally be expected to conform to certain standards of international examination of copies at first hand that cannot perhaps be expected from English scholars.

---

suitable numbers of directly compared copies to meet the standards of ideal descriptive bibliography, outside assistance of any variety cannot be a proper substitute for the bibliographer's own examination, although such assistance may be a useful supplement provided the copies so surveyed are strictly differentiated in order that a textual critic will not be misled in some cases through ignorance of the fact that variable standards have been applied to the list of copies examined.

A further question always arises, whether—when there is a sufficiency of material—one should confine oneself to the large libraries and special collections, making one's examination substantially complete, or else, at the expense of these institutions, whether one should bring in a liberal mixture from smaller holdings to which access may be more convenient. To put aside for the moment the convenience of the bibliographer, I believe that the reader is best served if the large or the specialist libraries—the great public collections—are drawn on almost exclusively whenever these will fill up one's quota of copies. I am inclined to dismiss private collectors completely when any other source is available, since such private collections are not at all times open to visiting scholars and are liable to dispersal on the owner's death.[8]

When one endeavors to survey the substantially complete holdings of great libraries, one is giving the reader a permanent record, and exact information, about copies in precisely those collections to which it is most worthwhile to travel for their wealth of material. Moreover, these are institutions with microfilming facilities, on which the reader can draw to secure a relatively inexpensive reproduction of a book in such and such a described state. Microfilm apparatus in some smaller institutions is by no means so common as is often supposed. For this reason, it is of more practical importance to the scholar to learn from a bibliography that a copy in a specified form is deposited in one of the

[8] There are qualifications to this statement, of course. Some books are so rare that copies must be examined in private collections merely because the total number of extant copies is insufficient to fill up the minimum required as the basis for a hypothetically definitive description. Moreover, if great private collections are eventually transferred to institutions as units, the scholar has no difficulty in discovering their whereabouts although listed in a bibliography as in private hands. Thus it has proved most useful for Greg to have listed the Wise holdings (now in the British Museum, where it is to be hoped they will be preserved intact) and the White collection (now chiefly at Harvard). But when a purchasing institution sells off duplicates, or a private collection is dispersed at auction, only the rarest, almost unique items are worth the tracking down through numerous enquiries. Since the whereabouts of excessively rare books is always a matter of scholarly interest, such books must be noted; but there is little point merely for the sake of convenience in listing a reasonably common item in any but a public collection.

great collections spotted about the country—as at Harvard, Yale, Folger, Library of Congress, Morgan, Chicago, Newberry, Clark, and Huntington—where he can get at it in the most convenient place without travelling to the ends of the earth, or else can secure photostats or microfilm without difficulty, than that it is in one of our several notable collections or in many average collections where microfilm can be secured only with difficulty if at all. This matter does not affect the bibliographical validity of one's description, of course, since this is not determined by the location—or even the survival—of the copies compared, but it does affect the use scholars can make of one's annotated list of copies examined.[9]

From the bibliographer's point of view, however, it would often be vastly more convenient—and often much less expensive[10]—to fill up his list without regard for these considerations, by selecting copies for their accessibility to himself and adding copies only from those collections with the most moderate filming charges. My own insistence on being substantially complete for the great collections in this country and in England will add several years to my task and more than several thousands of dollars to its cost, in part owing to the fact that not all librarians have been equally generous in their assistance, either in the loan of books or in help towards securing an inexpensive filming. One is

[9] I am not taking the position that the major usefulness of a descriptive bibliography lies in its annotated list of holdings, or that it should be written only with such a purpose in mind. The analytical examination and description of the 'ideal copy' of the book, with its variants, is the thing. And just as I believe that it is as important for the details of a description to be contrived to bring an absent book before a reader's eye as it is to provide a norm against which copies can be checked for conformity, so I put this matter of holdings on a secondary level to that of the description. Nevertheless, the practical uses which can be made of a bibliography cannot be ignored, and when one can increase its immediate usefulness by weighting the selection of copies in one direction rather than another without interfering with the qualities of the description, then I think a bibliographer must forego a certain amount of convenience to himself.

[10] As I write, I have just received a bill from one of this country's key rare book collections: the film charges have now been raised to the almost prohibitive figure of five cents a frame.

constantly, of course, running into restrictions on borrowing through one's own library what are only technically rare books, conventional regulations which could be lifted if the librarians really understood the problems one faces. Even large-scale microfilming as a substitute (which is much more expensive to the bibliographer, and is becoming increasingly so) may arouse passive resistance because it is undoubtedly a real nuisance to the libraries. An order to film several hundred books disrupts established routine, ties up equipment, and makes for a great deal of general trouble in locating and delivering books to the film department. Hence a bibliographer who must utilize film on a really grand scale can expect no reduction in fees for quantity, and, in a few rare cases, may even find extra charges above the regulation assessed against him for the work he is causing the library, and various other obstructions may be placed in his way when custodians are personally out of sympathy with descriptive bibliography or are inexperienced in its requirements and hence are inclined to make no concessions to one who cannot travel to their collections.[11]

[11] It is, of course, improper for a scholar to expect a library to make special financial concessions to him simply because he is engaged on a non-profit project like a bibliography. Thus it would be quite unreasonable to request a lower than normal rate on microfilming (except possibly from collections where the photographic laboratory is not run at cost as a public service but is expected to turn in a neat profit), or films or photostats without charge. However, it may not be entirely unreasonable to hope that various service charges designed to protect libraries against the uneconomic filming of very small orders could be waived when a large-scale filming is requested, so that the library will not collect a profit from a bibliographical project which is endeavoring to analyze that particular collection for the benefit of the public. Sometimes double service charges, which may run into the hundreds of dollars for large orders, are encountered when a collection without equipment sends its books to a neighboring institution for filming. These matters are arguable, I am well aware, for libraries in this interlibrary loan and microfilm era are being pinched by the real expenses accompanying their increasing public responsibilities as the depositories of rare books. Special circumstances, however, might warrant special concessions. As an instance, especially for large orders I think it is legitimate for bibliographers to object when expensive frills in filming will not be cancelled to help lower costs. Thus on orders involving hundreds of books on film which a bibliographer will use only once as a means of comparing inaccessible duplicate copies, it is rather dismaying to be forced to pay special charges for the filming of a preliminary letter-board title to each book, or to find, too late, that unless special instructions are given, each five

Fortunately, these are exceptions, and ordinarily it is heartwarming to find that most custodians are conscious of what is a kind of public responsibility accompanying the possession of a large number of rare books of scholarly interest, and hence are eager to assist in opening up their collections for examination by one means or another. Yet when the rare cases of passive obstruction to the necessities of large-scale bibliographical research are encountered, the bibliographer may be strongly tempted not to undergo the serious extra drain on his slender funds, but instead to omit completely, or else to make only the most necessary small selection from such collections. Nevertheless, as a duty to the ultimate reader, I think he must persist in trying to be substantially complete, and somehow swallow the extra expense[12]—along with his gall.

---

to ten foot filmed book in one's order will arrive wound on a separate one hundred foot reel in a neatly labelled box, each representing an additional special charge above published rates. It is very crass of me, of course, to speak so much of money and the financial troubles one encounters in bibliography; but scholarship cannot be produced on a chameleon's diet, and a descriptive bibliographer with a big project must perforce make every effort to see that his limited funds will produce the maximum amount of material for his uses and are not frittered away on non-essentials or excessive charges. It is one of his never-ending chores, therefore, to attempt to reach a proper understanding with libraries whose collections he must work with over the course of years whether using borrowed originals or else microfilm, and it is always a disappointment when a suitable agreement, fair to both, cannot be reached for his large requirements. Naturally, I have a one-track mind in this matter; still I cannot help feeling that rare-book custodians—who will certainly make extensive use of descriptive bibliographies in their purchases—ought also to welcome having their own holdings analyzed in print for the benefit of those scholars who might want to use their collections. However, this point of view is not always recognized, and a bibliographer who is not relying on answers to enquiries learns not to expect helpful concessions for his project either in the matter of filming, or often in the loan of books. Books which might have been made available to a literary investigator may be refused a bibliographer on the grounds that loans "for routine bibliographical examination" are not the policy of the library.

[12] The substantive editions, at any rate, ought to be made complete under any circumstances. Thereupon, no one can blame a bibliographer too harshly if for later and textually less important editions he slights the holdings of a few collections, no matter how notable, where the cost of an examination proves to be higher than normal either in travel or film expense and where equalizing concessions will not be made, provided these are not among the basic key collections both in England and America which under any circumstances must be substantially complete in one's listings.

Another factor which might lead a bibliographer to favor the sometimes less expensive and often highly coöperative smaller collections is the chance for making new finds, perhaps increased in the less populated libraries where the books have not had the going-over to which itinerant scholars have subjected copies in famous collections. For just such chances, suitable opportunities should not be dismissed for adding a generous sprinkling from less prominent collections; but as a general proposition I hold by the overall value to the reader of the substantially complete assessment of great collections, in spite of the expense in this country of the necessary travelling from coast to coast, or the sometimes more costly equivalent in microfilm. This is, I think, a basic duty for a bibliographer, who should always have in mind the practical uses which scholars will make of his annotated descriptions.[13]

Once the *where* of examination has been decided, the *how* appears. For true descriptive bibliography of the highest standards, with early books at least, I do not see how one can properly work only from notes. I cannot emphasize too strongly my considered opinion that the examination of each copy of a hand-printed book must be direct, and must be made against a control. To a certain extent, I think that we must adjust our own methods to American conditions. When, as so often, a bibliographer can spread out three or four copies of a book in the British Museum and make a careful direct comparison, he can then transport his notes to the Bodleian and to Cambridge, and when direct comparison of several duplicates in each place reveals no new variants with one an-

[13] As a practical matter to the bibliographer, it will sometimes be found that the condition of books is superior in the large or specialist collections: there are numerous positive advantages in working only with copies where the letterpress of the text as well as of the headlines and direction-lines is complete, and where missing leaves as well as shaved letterpress are less often encountered. On the other hand, I know from experience that real finds may sometimes be made in copies which have been neglected because they were partially mutilated. Actually, all books are grist for the bibliographical mill: there are often marked advantages in working with ordinary copies where expensive rebindings have not destroyed bibliographical evidence of make-up.

other, or so far as can be determined with his notes, he may be inclined to feel reasonably confident that in other copies no major variations will appear which he cannot detect by title photostats or transcripts, his formulary collation, and various perhaps elaborate notes on contents, running-titles, and catchwords.

In spite of the fact that there has been no control set up between the British Museum and the other copies in this hypothetical instance, the odds are certainly in favor of the bibliographer's being right much more often than he is wrong. But such a situation can occur only rarely in America, where our wealth of rare books is more thinly spread and where the preservation of duplicates is not always the library ritual which it should be—from the point of view of the bibliographer. Moreover—at least for the kind of material I am working with, and I should venture to say for any hand-printed book—it does not follow that without consistent direct comparison of each copy examined against a control, numerous small but important points of variance will, even in the majority of cases, be detected by a bibliographer working only from notes and going from library to library. Notes simply cannot be sufficiently minute to detect many of these differences. And, by bad luck, these rare (perhaps unique) points of variance will often exist in the only copy held by a library so that they cannot be discovered by direct comparison of duplicates in any one place.

Customary standards will ordinarily detect variants of issue proportions, although—as I have observed—close piracies or reprints as well as editions partly from standing type may sometimes slip through the net when there has been no opportunity to perceive them by direct comparison of duplicates in a single collection. Moreover, smaller points like reset formes or sheets—these of extreme interest to textual criticism—may be quite impossible to determine when duplicate comparison cannot be made and a control is absent. In my work I have turned up significant

examples of this kind of variation which could not have been noticed without a control because in every superficial aspect the resetting appeared to be the same as the original. This also applies to the detection of "sophistication" among one's listed copies. If the accurate details of made-up copies are not provided, scholars may be led sadly astray when they use such books unwittingly.

Therefore I am convinced that bibliographers who must examine large numbers of copies in various places, cannot trust to title photostats or transcripts supplemented by notes when moving from collection to collection. My own solution, and it has worked very well so far, is to have a control or master microfilm of every play in all its variant states, and to make a page by page typographical checking[14] against this control film of every copy I compare whether I am in a distant collection or in my own university library. In this manner one is able to guarantee what I think is the ideal that we should aim at in descriptive bibliography, *that every copy listed as examined is, for every page, in the identical typesetting as every other, unless variance is noted.* Normal press-correction from proof is excluded, of course, since to determine this one would need to make a letter-for-letter textual collation, although the development of Dr. Hinman's collating machine will doubtless in the future make the listing of all proof-variants a requirement also.

This use of a control microfilm for precise comparison has various other virtues, to which I shall revert shortly. Its principle, however, can be extended to solve in part another major problem in large-scale bibliography—the time element. A really big bibliography which treats a popular type of literature, or any such major project as to write a definitive, detailed bibliography of a widely published author like Dryden, Swift, Defoe, or Pope according to the highest standards, might be dabbled at as a hobby

[14] By typographical checking I mean a quick comparison of the form and position of the running-title, pagination, signature, and catchword, combined with several specific points of alignment or peculiarity in the text type in each page, all to determine positive identity of typesetting.

for many years, and with luck might be finished while one was still alive, if one began young enough. But a single bibliography as an intensive research project should not necessarily be enforced on one as the sole preoccupation of a lifetime, and one ought reasonably to expect to bring a definitive bibliography, even of massive proportions, to a close within ten or fifteen years of its start. Yet unless we are to restrict descriptive bibliography only to those with private incomes or to professionals salaried by a foundation, it is clear that the time available for such research by a librarian[15] or a university teacher, even taking into account vacationless summers and an occasional or sabbatical year's leave of absence, is insufficient for visiting all necessary collections in order to make the personal comparisons of the large numbers of duplicate copies that proper bibliographical standards require.[16]

Hence, duplicate microfilm must in part substitute for books in distant collections, and indeed, these days, if a descriptive bibliography of proper standards is to be written for early books, there must be an equitable division between one's severely re-

[15] In the past, librarians have frequently been bibliographers because the accessibility of books in their own libraries promoted bibliography. But the present-day standards for multiple examination of copies in descriptive bibliography no longer put the average librarian at any marked advantage unless he is so fortunate as to be located at a huge collection rich in duplicates so that he may readily lay a good foundation there before the required outside research becomes necessary.

[16] This obvious fact that there simply is not time for a descriptive bibliographer to travel and work the necessary length of time at every collection which he must examine—also that there is simply not enough money for expenses available to any scholar for this procedure—and finally that he must make a controlled comparison himself and not trust to anyone else answering enquiries—these obvious facts seem incomprehensible to some librarians who have not adjusted themselves to modern bibliographical as well as the literary or historical use of rare books. Through this lack of understanding of what constitutes modern bibliography, far too many refuse to lend not really very rare books although heavily insured on interlibrary loan, and insist that one come to their institutions if work is to be done on their copies. If this requirement were universal, one might as well give up an attempt at proper descriptive bibliography. Clearly, one cannot remain employed by a university, a library, or a business and also, within one's lifetime, visit and work through for any large project the collections of Folger, Huntington, Clark, Chapin, Boston Public, New York Public, Library of Congress, Harvard, Yale, Chicago, Newberry, and Texas, to say nothing of the British Museum, Dyce, Bodleian, Trinity College, and Cambridge collections. Yet these are all libraries which—with some others—should be substantially represented in any first-class bibliography.

stricted travelling time, the very extensive use of duplicate microfilm, and the borrowing of books from collections not restricted by their deed of foundation. Travelling time is limited, and if exorbitant demands are made upon it, then completion of the project and publication is indefinitely postponed. However, microfilm costs pyramid so rapidly for complete sets of duplicates that films, although most important for one's plans, cannot be an exclusive substitute for travel that cannot be undertaken. For this reason, in considerable proportion, books must come on loan to the bibliographer, as well as he to the books, so that he can proceed through the whole working year without pause.

Given this understanding and generous coöperation from various important collections, a very satisfactory efficient routine can be evolved for performing mass comparison of copies within the absolute minimum of time. From those collections from which loans cannot be secured and which cannot be fitted into one's travelling schedule for the necessary extensive stay, duplicate microfilms can be purchased and a large file assembled. Then when one's library receives several packages of books on loan, one can sit down at the film reading machine and in one operation compare several "live" copies against a half-dozen or so microfilm duplicates, and thus, wherever one may be, create a utopian Folger and British Museum rolled into one. There are various dangers in the use of microfilm, of course, and occasional enquiries are necessary about the presence or absence of blanks; but since in ordinary circumstances by a combination of borrowing and travel one should expect to see about half or more of one's list of duplicate copies in "live" books, usually there is little difficulty except with the most uncommon items in determining immediately the correct makeup and being able to write a trial description which should be close to the final form.

In addition to this employment of duplicate film for the direct comparison of otherwise inaccessible copies, the use of a master

microfilm saves a great deal of time, since tentative descriptions from the film can be written at home, and thus one need not spend precious library hours on anything but the all-important comparison and analysis of copies. The control film is also a blessing for checking. Each description should be given several checks against actual copies as they come in; but before the material goes to the printer it can be rigorously rechecked against the film, and in turn the proofs can be checked not only against the typescript but also against the film again. This complete checking at any stage of the process could not be made for all one's books in any library in the world; moreover, with film it can be done at any hour of the day or night, and thus one is emancipated from the rigid closing hours of rare book rooms and from the inevitable errors of notes and typescripts.

If this were a complete discussion, it would take in the problems of ordering, receiving, and filing thousands of feet of microfilm. The search for adequate funds, without which the most exact and efficient work cannot be accomplished. The problems of writing the descriptions, of how much to describe in books, and how minutely, for the sake of the reader. The problems of photographic reproductions of title-pages in a bibliography *versus* quasi-facsimile transcripts. The real virtues to reproducing photographically each ornament, initial, and factotum and referring to it in one's descriptions by assigned number. But these are of lesser import than the major problems behind the practice of descriptive bibliography which I have tried to sketch in.

All these, one hopes, will be in a reader's mind when he opens a bibliography of great size and scope done according to what I take it will prove to be the necessary standards of modern descriptive bibliography. The actual expenses of such a project, without regard for the bibliographer's time or his own incidentals, or for publication subsidy, may run from ten to fifteen thousand dollars or more. The time—a minimum of ten years. The finan-

cial returns—nil. But in spite of the drudgery—and for sheer drudgery there is nothing like much of the routine of bibliographical work—no bibliographer would give up the thrill of chasing the elusive variant always to be found, of course, just in the next copy, or the satisfaction, at the end, of a solid piece of work accomplished, which, God willing, will stand up under the test of time and will never need to be done again.

The Tunebook of Conrad Doll

By

Robert Benaway Brown and Frank X. Braun

ONE hundred and fifty years ago, despite the absence of either Sinatras or Pinzas, music played a considerably more important part in the life of the average American than it does today. If a slight confusion of the senses may be overlooked, we can say that music then was less of a spectator sport.

Books were not exactly scarce, but neither were they plentiful, especially in the newly settled districts. If the pioneer was lucky, he had a weekly paper. An almanac was standard equipment, and there were long and hearty sermons available on the Sabbath, offering abstruse reasoning or hellfire by the hogshead, according to the pioneer's inclination. But along with occasional rifle matches, dances, and bouts with J. Barleycorn, these nearly completed the catalogue of his available amusements.

A fair part of the rest of his none too abundant leisure was devoted to singing. And much of this musical activity was on a fairly elaborate scale; that is, part singing was normal practice and ventures into reasonably elaborate arrangements were not unknown.

This was particularly true in the German settlements. A more than usually pious folk, some of the practices listed above were, in theory at least, taboo for them. Consequently, there was a sincere and widespread enthusiasm among the Pennsylvania Dutch for music in general and singing in particular. The singing school was as much a part of existence as the Sunday sermon.

Most of this singing was done from manuscript books of tunes, sometimes with words written in but more usually, perhaps, with

only the music. As any music copyist will affirm, this is at best a tedious and imperfect means of supplying any very considerable demand.

This was the problem faced by one Conrad Doll of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and solved by him in his *Sammlung / Geistlicher Lieder nebst Melodien, / von Verschiedenen Dichtern und Componisten. / Gedruckt und Herausgegeben / von / Conrad Doll. Lancaster. / 1798.*[1]

Among the scarcer of German-American imprints, this little book is known in only two copies, one in the Herbert C. Ely collection of the William L. Clements Library and the other in the library of Dr. W. H. Oda, of Philadelphia. Neither is described in bibliographies, and the book was not known to either Evans[2] or Seidensticker.[3] Both copies have turned up very recently.

Aside from its rarity, this represents, insofar as an extensive search has revealed, the first German-American singing book printed before 1800 in which the music is presented in parts together with all the words for several stanzas.[4] And, as will be indicated, it shows strong evidences of both the effect upon the transplanted German community of the musical work being produced in other sections of the new country and of the best hymnody of their religion in the continent from which they had come.

Doll appears on the title-page as printer and publisher, but the announcement should, apparently, be taken with a goodly sized portion of salt, since nothing that is known of him indicates that he ever had anything to do with the inside of a print shop. This leaves the possible printers as Johann Albrecht *u.comp.*, Robert and William Dickson, William Hamilton, Conrad Wort-

[1] [6] p.l., 109, [3] p. 12.6 x 25.6cm. (inside covers). Both copies.

[2] Charles Evans, *American Bibliography*. Vol. XII, 1798-1799 (Chicago, Ill., Privately printed for the author by the Columbia Press, 1934).

[3] Oswald Seidensticker, *The First Century of German Printing in America, 1728-1830* (Philadelphia, Schaefer & Koradi, 1893).

[4] Allen P. Britton, *Theoretical Introductions in American Tunebooks to 1800* (Unpublished manuscript. Ann Arbor, Michigan, University of Michigan, 1948).

man, and Jacob Lahn.[5] Christian Jacob Hütter has also been suggested, but there is no certainty that he was established until the following year. Examination of the type and typography in books produced by these several printers and publishers has as yet given no definite answer as to the press which turned out the book under the Doll imprint.

On the verso of the title-page is a short preface by the Rev. Christian Ludwig Becker, signed with his initials. Becker was, at the time, the local pastor.[6] His preface gives the reasons which motivated Doll in his pioneer production.

"It hardly needs any proof," says Becker, "that a beautiful song, sung according to the rules of the art, not only ennobles the sentiments of the heart but also contributes greatly to the heightening of devotion during the service."

He goes on to deplore the state of the German-American singing schools, or at least the state of their output in the way of song. The reason they are so far behind their European counterparts, he says, is that "the music books . . . had to be written by hand." Since few people have either the desire or the ability to undertake this laborious task, the singers have had to get along with the old songs already in their *répertoire.*

As a result, according to Becker, the enthusiasm of the singers has waned. But Doll, with his new collection, hopes to provide novelty, the desire for which "lies deep in the human heart."

If Doll finds encouragement, Becker adds, "then he is resolved to furnish continuations in similar volumes until this work has reached a degree of perfection that approaches the best German works of this kind."

Regretfully, we must assume that the sought after encouragement was not forthcoming, since Doll's single volume stands completely alone.

[5] Evans, *op. cit.*, p. 413-414.

[6] Henry Harbaugh, *The Fathers of the German Reformed Church in Europe and America* (Lancaster and Philadelphia, Sprenger and Westhaeffer, 1857-1881). III: 65.

The style and orthography of the preface is that of a cultured man, which Becker was, and is in sharp contrast to the second section, *Short and Necessary Instruction in Vocal Music*, which is most probably by Doll himself.

In those days, the work of a schoolmaster, which Doll's father was and which Doll was to become, had considerably more content than that of the pedagogue today. He "kept" the school, but he was also expected to act as chorister and organist, and in the absence of a minister, he was to read sermons and conduct public worship.[7] The German-American schoolmaster's qualifications, like those of his New England contemporary, had little to do with education.[8] The emphasis was placed upon his ability to play the organ, lead the singing, act as sexton, and serve as clerk of the church.[9] Of these, organ playing and song leading were probably the most important.[10] And in addition to the musical part of his specifically churchly duties, he very often conducted a singing school, for which latter he might receive some small supplement to his normally meagre stipend.[11]

This, then, was the *milieu* in which Doll matured, and from which the tunebook of 1798 emerges. The school was certainly a typical parochial school of the Reformed Church, where it was required that the Bible be read and explained, that the catechism be used as a statement of doctrine, and that prayer and singing be heard and taught.[12]

The curriculum of the schools of the German Reformed Church in the eighteenth century can be briefly summarized as reading, writing, spelling, arithmetic, and religious instruction,

[7] Frederic George Livingood, *Eighteenth Century Reformed Church Schools*, in: Pennsylvania German Society, *Proceedings and Addresses* (Norristown, Pa., Norristown Press, 1930), XXXVIII: 258.

[8] Colyer Meriwether, *Our Colonial Curriculum, 1607-1776* (Washington, D. C., Capital Publishing Co., 1907), p. 17.

[9] Livingood, *op. cit.*, p. 259-260.

[10] Livingood, *op. cit.*, p. 259ff.

[11] Livingood, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

[12] Livingood, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

the latter including singing.[13] Hymn books were almost certainly used in the schools, as a great deal of the time was devoted to singing.[14] An example might well be Sauer's 1753 reprint of the Marburg Reformed hymn book, which also conveniently contained the Heidelburg catechism.[15]

In his instructions to the prospective singer and in his dissertation on the rudiments of music, Doll follows with remarkable fidelity the work of William Tans'ur (1699-1783), whose *opera* were widely used and widely borrowed in the American tunebooks of the period.[16] He does, however, vary from Tans'ur's pattern in his failure to present a scheme of solmization, the provision of syllabic substitutes for notes, as "do re mi fa" and so forth.[17] In any event, Doll indicates a definite familiarity with what his English singing neighbors were doing in the way of music.

The orthography of this whole section shows peculiar discrepancies in comparison with Pastor Becker's preface and Doll's own sources. Capitalization of nouns is standard and uniform in the Swiss hymnals from which Doll's selections came and in the preface of the work. But the rest of the book seems to lack any guiding principles, and its erratic character extends into the hymns themselves. Within the same song, nouns appear first capitalized and later in lower case. Adjectives and adverbs leap from upper to lower case with the same impartiality. The printer or proofreader may not, of course, be entirely blameless, but the careless attitude would seem to argue the compiler's lack of familiarity with the "modern" German of his day.

There may, however, be a certain sly Calvinistic method in part of Doll's orthographic madness. The one rule followed with

[13] Livingood, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 240.

[15] Seidensticker, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

[16] William Tans'ur, *The American Harmony; or, Royal Melody Complete.* Sixth edition (Newburyport, Printed and sold by Daniel Bailey, 1771). 2 vols.

[17] Britton, *op. cit.*

any consistency at all is that any appellations referring to the Deity and to Biblical characters are capitalized. The names of Satan and Mary are the exceptions: they are invariably in lower case.

Conrad was the son of John Doll, schoolmaster at the Reformed Church School at Lancaster, Pennsylvania.[18] Little is known of his early years or of his musical interests and training. The church records[19] do tell us that an increase in his father's salary was in part justified by Conrad's organ playing. Conrad continued as organist after his father's death in 1807, and later was to hold both positions up to the time of his abrupt dismissal in 1819.[20]

As to Doll's training as an organist, it seems reasonable to assume that he studied under that cultured scrivener and author of the famous *Music Book*, Caspar Schaffner,[21] who taught music and penmanship and played the church organ (built by Tannenberg) from 1795 to 1799. It is quite possible, then, that it was under the influence of the musician and composer Schaffner that Conrad Doll compiled and published his *Sammlung* in 1798. An assumption that Doll might have published his teacher's *Music Book* proved incorrect, for a comparison[22] of the contents of the Doll book with those of the Schaffner manuscript showed conclusively that no connection existed between the two. The selections in the manuscript include hymns, fiddlers' tunes, catholic anthems, American marches, and patriotic songs of Schaffner's own

[18] For bibliographical data on Conrad Doll we are indebted to Elizabeth C. Kieffer, Reference Librarian of the Fackenthal Library, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and Archivist of the First Evangelical and Reformed Church of Lancaster, the church of both Doll and his father.

[19] First Evangelical and Reformed Church of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, *Consistory Records*, January 4, 1806.

[20] First Evangelical and Reformed Church of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, *Consistory Records*, 1806-1819.

[21] Described in Elizabeth C. Kieffer, *Three Caspar Schaffners*. In: Lancaster County Historical Society. *Historical Papers and Addresses* (Lancaster, Pa.), XLII: 195ff. (1938).

[22] Undertaken by Elizabeth C. Kieffer.

composing, as well as selections from Handel, Haydn, Pleyel, and Mozart. The Doll book, on the other hand, restricts itself exclusively to songs of a religious nature.

The sources from which Conrad Doll drew the hymns for his *Sammlung* have both historical and cultural interest. In the book, he mentions three names, Zollikofer, Bachofen, and Schmidlin, all three of them Swiss. Whether his choice was conditioned by the availability of song collections or by his own personal preference is, of course, impossible to determine. If he had any choice, it was probably musical considerations that made him, the descendant of emigrants from the Palatinate, prefer Swiss song collections to those composed in his grandfather's home district. Whatever his considerations were, he chose well, for these three Swiss hymn compilers and composers were the outstanding representatives of Swiss hymnody in the mid-eighteenth century.

Zollikofer, Bachofen, and Schmidlin represent a link in a pious chain reaction that had its origin in the Netherlands in the seventeenth century. In the prosperous Dutch states, once the Reformed Church had successfully emerged from its internal religious struggles, there arose a reform movement under the leadership of Jodocus van Lodenstein[23] (1620-1677), "The Rejuvenator."

Through the medium of the hymn, Lodenstein and his followers attempted to bridge the gap between formalized surface religiosity and the subjective, emotional, and nearly mystic approach to matters of faith. This new note of pietistic individualism which was in time to soften the hard shell of Calvinist orthodoxy manifested itself in the lyrics and compositions of a host of hymn writers.[24] These soon found their way into northwestern and central Germany.[25] By the time this pietistic wave reached

[23] His famous hymn book, *Uytspannigen* (Utrecht, 1676) went into sixteen editions.

[24] Joachim Neander (1650-1680), Richard Tersteegen (1697-1769), and others.

[25] Among them Hermann Reinhold Pauli (1682-1750) and Johann Wilhelm Krafft (1696-1767).

Switzerland in the second decade of the eighteenth century, it contained not only its original Dutch components but had had superimposed upon these, on its way through Germany, the coloration of Lutheran Spenerism and Hallensian pietism.

To be sure, these new hymns of the reform movement did not gain access into the official songbooks of the Reformed Church in any of the three countries. In Switzerland, they were used mainly in private religious circles, in the pietistic meetings which were frowned upon by church and state authorities and which were for a time, in 1716, actually forbidden. Pietistic and religious as the lyrics of these hymns were, their melodies, according to Koch,[26] often approached the aria, as had those of their German forerunners.

Yet even the early Swiss hymn writers[27] added a touch of their own. Melodies taken over from the German received in their hands additional worldly touches in the form of increasing numbers of slurred notes and in an often minuet-like arrangement. Since the Swiss Calvinist Church looked askance at any man-made songs and adhered strictly to the psalms for official church use, the Swiss hymn writers actually wrote and composed for popular consumption, and hence adapted their productions to popular taste. The most ingenious and inventive of these Swiss hymn writers were Zollikofer, Schmidlin, and Bachofen, the sources of Conrad Doll's *Sammlung*.

Caspar Bachofen (1692-1755), pastor and cantor of a reformed church in Zürich, is chiefly known for his hymn book *Musikalisches Halleluja*,[28] from which Doll took seventeen songs. The bulk of the Lancaster schoolmaster's collection, thirty-four

[26] Eduard Emil Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenlieds und Kirchengesangs der Christlichen, Inbesondere der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche* (Stuttgart, C. Belser, 1866-1877). VI: 110.

[27] Johann Ludwig Steiner, *Neues Gesangbuch* . . . (Zürich, Heidegger und Rahn, 1723); Johann Kaspar Degeller, *Hymni* . . . (Schauffhausen, J. A. Ziegler, 1732); Caspar Zollikofer, *Gebät-Music* (St. Gallen, 1738), and others.

[28] The first edition of this work was in 1727. A fifth edition was published in 1750 in Zürich by Bürkli.

pieces, came from Johannes Schmidlin, the bachelor pastor of Wetzlikon. Schmidlin is unique in at least one respect, for in the dedication to his collection of hymns, *Singendes und Spielendes Vergnügen Reiner Andacht* . . . (Zürich, Bürkli, 1752), he acknowledges that he drew on the lyrics of such famous poets as Haller, Canitz, and Triller, and on the pious melodies of Kreuzberg, Schmoll, Rambach, and others. Schmidlin's melodies, at least in Koch's opinion, are too frivolous and playful, and are therefore inferior to those of Bachofen.[29]

There is but one hymn taken over from the *Gebät-Music*[30] of Caspar Zollikofer, a man whose name is securely established not only in the history of hymnody but in the history of German literature as well. With Meister and Keller von Uri, he was a collaborator in Bodmer and Breitinger's journal *Die Discurse der Mahlern* (Zürich, 1721-1723).

So, in the hymn collection of a Lancaster schoolteacher and organist, there is reflected a definite evolutionary stage in Calvinist hymnody, the cumulative poetic and spiritual products of Dutch, German, and Swiss pietism, clad in the attractive musical patterns of three Swiss hymnodists. Doll's *Sammlung* was unquestionably a striking piece of musical pioneering among his Zwinglian brethren of Lancaster. It is doubtful, however, that his selections found any immediate acceptance among the official church songs. It was many years after the death of his Swiss models before some of their hymns were adapted for church use.

Conrad Doll's attempt to draw inspiration from European religiosity displays a typical chronological lag that is frequently ap-

[29] Koch, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

[30] A fuller title of this work is: *Himmlisch-Gesinnter Seelen Himmel-Durchschallende und Unsern Gott Billig hoch Verherrlichende Gebät-Music, das ist: Geistreiches Gesang-und Gebät-Buch, bestehend in 1000 auserlesenen Seufzer-oder Gebät-Weisen gestellten sowohl alten als aber auch viel und noch mehr neuen, verändert und verbesserten geistlichen lieblichen Liedern, mit anmutigen, aus unterschiedlichen Musicalischen Büchern gezogenen, auch zum theil gantz neu-componierten liechten Melodien zu 2, 3, 4 und 5 stimmen. Nebst einem accurat gezeichneten Generalbass* (St. Gallen, Gedruckt bei Ruprecht Weniger, 1738).

parent in the cultural patterns of immigrants who lean spiritually on the old soil. For in the year of publication of the *Sammlung*, which he certainly meant to represent the latest in hymnody, the Continental hymn writers were already well into the next stage of their development. Their songs, by that time, bore the characteristic stamp of moralistic and predicating rationalism.

But in technique, in his presentation of musical knowledge, Doll was certainly on an even plane with the rest of his American contemporaries. Long after 1798, English-American songbooks were coming off the press which were definitely inferior to the Lancaster imprint that has become both a curiosity and a rarity.

The State of the Issue

By Paul S. Dunkin

"WHAT is Issue?" said jesting Bibliographer, and would not stay for an answer. Had he stayed for Mr. F. T. Bowers he would have had an answer in earnest.

Mr. Bowers sets forth his answer in the B. S. A. Papers 41: 271-292 (1947) with the same stimulating originality which has marked his other bibliographical work. His ideas are drastic. If generally adopted, they will take away or change the meaning given to "issue" currently and in the past in printed bibliographies, checklists, and card catalogues. For this reason it may be worth while to examine rather carefully the method by which Mr. Bowers comes to his conclusions.

Only if we accept his distinctions, Mr. Bowers feels, shall we "most truly follow McKerrow's implicit and sound principles" (p. 291). His article is, indeed, largely based on an interpretation of some remarks about issues in R. B. McKerrow's *Introduction to Bibliography* (1927), which Mr. Bowers feels are "completely sound in spite of a loophole or two and some surface ambiguities" (p. 274).

McKerrow (*Int.* p. 177) listed four occasions of reissue giving an example of each: (1) in order to indicate a change in the publishing arrangements; (2) in order to add new preliminary matter; (3) in order to make an old book appear a new one; and (4) in order to make some correction or alteration in the preliminary matter. Although McKerrow mentioned cancel title-pages specifically only in describing his examples of occasions (1) and (3), Mr. Bowers urges (p. 275) that "we must assume that this

additional requirement [the cancel title-page] was present in McKerrow's mind" for all four occasions because of McKerrow's "important earlier remark (*Int.* p. 176) that ordinarily addition to the preliminaries is insufficient to cause re-issue without change in the title," and because, although McKerrow did not note the fact in connection with occasions (2) and (4), all four examples actually involve cancel title-pages (p. 274). McKerrow, he feels, also "sets up a criterion of some moment" (p. 275) when, in his discussion of occasion (4), he remarked (*Int.* p. 177) that copies with altered preliminaries should be considered as a separate issue only if the main intention seemed to have been to give new life to the old sheets rather than merely to correct something.

Mr. Bowers thus concludes that there are actually only "two major classes of re-issue . . . (a) alterations in the publishing arrangements as indicated by a cancellans title-page; (b) alterations or additions to the preliminaries not for the purposes of correction but to assist in stimulating the sale of old sheets"; this class also has a cancel title-page (p. 275).

This transformation of McKerrow's four occasions into Mr. Bowers' "two major classes" is a rather remarkable performance. McKerrow introduced his group thus: "The occasions of such reissues in early times were generally either" etc. (*Int.* p. 177). By the word "occasions" McKerrow seems to have meant "attendant circumstances" or "background" or even "causes," but surely not "characteristics" or "requirements." This, incidentally, may explain McKerrow's failure to mention cancel title-pages (a failure which causes Mr. Bowers some concern); for, while a cancel title-page may be a characteristic or a requirement, it is not necessarily an occasion. Again there is McKerrow's word "generally"; this also is by no means restrictive. Apparently McKerrow recognized other occasions of reissue, not so frequent, indeed, as those he listed, but just as valid.

What Mr. Bowers calls McKerrow's "important earlier remark" on the need of a cancel title-page occurs as a footnote to

McKerrow's statement that in a new issue old sheets "have been bound up with a new title-page or with new preliminary matter" (*Int.* p. 176). The footnote states that "the mere addition of new matter *without* a new title-page, especially if the addition only consists of a dedication or an epistle to the reader, is not generally regarded as constituting a new issue." It is significant that McKerrow retained the alternative "or with new preliminary matter" in his text in spite of the footnote. In the footnote itself the "especially" clause suggests qualification, and the phrase "is not generally regarded" is also important. It seems necessary to assume either (1) that in the text McKerrow gave his own preference and in the footnote he added what he considered common usage; or (2) that McKerrow was himself uncertain or at least that (unlike Mr. Bowers) he did not consider his footnote statement an "important remark"—otherwise, he would have put it in his main text or at least he would have modified his main text after adding the footnote.

The "criterion of some moment" that only "alterations or additions which attempt to *give new life to old sheets* are re-issues" (p. 275) is also stated without fanfare by McKerrow (*Int.* p. 177). McKerrow's occasion (4) was "in order to make some correction or alteration in the preliminary matter." McKerrow then went on to say that it is "often questionable" whether we should regard altered preliminary matter as creating a separate issue. "Which we do should depend on whether the main intention seems to be to *correct* something (in which case it is a cancel) or to give a new life to the old sheets (in which case it is a reissue)." But McKerrow had already admitted "some correction" as an alternative to simple "alteration" in describing the occasion; the two statements are contradictory. Here again it would seem probable that if McKerrow thought "new life to old sheets" a really major criterion he would have modified his original text after adding the afterthought.

McKerrow's whole paragraph on his four occasions is really

quite casual, but Mr. Bowers' two classes are sharply defined. Mr. Bowers gets this result because he takes over only some of McKerrow's suggestions and rejects others. It seems a bit strong to consider the two classes as McKerrow's and later to speak of McKerrow's "restrictions" (p. 277) or McKerrow's "basic criteria" (p. 287).

With his two-class view of reissue Mr. Bowers finds two faults: (1) alterations or additions within the body of the book are as common as those in the preliminaries; and (2) a bibliographer's decision as to a publisher's intention in altering or adding material must be subjective and, hence, often different from other scholars' decisions. The first of these difficulties has been met by a "general tendency to treat preliminaries and text on the same level" (a solution of which Mr. Bowers quite properly approves); and the second, by adoption of the "superficially simple principle" that only alterations or additions made "after publication constitute re-issues." Thus "publisher's intention—which McKerrow took as a most important factor—is completely ignored in most cases.... On occasion, even this temporality [a word by which Mr. Bowers appears to mean something like 'time relationship'] based on the moment of first public sale is ignored, and any two differing forms of the book are listed as 'issues' " (p. 277).

Mr. Bowers then shows conclusively, with a wealth of interesting illustrations, that "temporality" alone is not enough because it is often hard or even impossible to prove the "temporality" of different forms of a book. The alternative—calling each form of the book an "issue" with complete disregard of "temporality"—he also rejects because it "leads to a naïve multiplication of 'simultaneous issues' " (p. 277). He feels that "simultaneous issue" as well as "re-issue," if they are "each to have any practical value as more than a bookseller's phrase must conform to one basic criterion: separate sale *as a consistent unit* of copies of one issue from another" (p. 286-287).

"Simultaneous issue," he feels, is, indeed, a "very restricted category. . . . There are only three classes of *simultaneous issue* which conform to McKerrow's basic criteria for *re-issue*. . . . (1) Press-alteration of a title-page consequent upon issue of a book in two different forms consistent with the variant forms of the title. . . . (2) Copies on large or fine paper differing in form in a manner impossible for an 'ideal copy' of the trade edition. . . . (3) Re-imposition of the identical type in another format after the printing of a sheet. . . ." (p. 287-288).

The source of Mr. Bowers' "one basic criterion: separate sale *as a consistent unit*" is not too clear. Both here and on page 274 Mr. Bowers seems to identify, or at least include, it with "McKerrow's basic criteria for *re-issue*." But it can be derived from McKerrow's four occasions only if one assumes (as Mr. Bowers did before with the cancel title-page) that McKerrow must have had it in mind because his examples of reissue probably conform to it; this explanation, indeed, seems to be implied in Mr. Bowers' brief elaboration of the "criterion" on page 287.

McKerrow, however, was writing only of reissue; even if we accept "separate sale *as a consistent unit*" as part of "McKerrow's basic criteria for *re-issue*," there seems to be no need to assume that McKerrow would have required it also for "simultaneous issue." "Re-issue," after all, must always involve "temporality" regardless of what else may be required; "simultaneous issue," on the other hand, cannot have "temporality." Moreover, McKerrow, as Mr. Bowers notes with approval (p. 278-279), denied the status of issue to variant copies of books like the 1632 Shakespeare folio whose imprints were altered at press in order to provide individual imprints for a number of publishers. Yet the batch of copies assigned to each publisher surely enjoyed "separate sale *as a consistent unit*."

Mr. Bowers himself introduces a note of uncertainty when he writes that "re-issue" has no meaning if "applied to alterations which cannot be demonstrated to be reflected in consistently sep-

arate sale of copies or in attempts to rejuvenate sale" (p. 287). Can a "basic criterion" also be an alternative criterion?

It seems, moreover, rather hard to apply the "consistent unit" criterion, as may be shown by a glance at some of the books which Mr. Bowers rejects as reissues (p. 279-283) because "temporality" cannot be proved definitely. The following books, he notes, exist in two or more forms:

Arte of English Poesie (1589): (1) The text goes directly from N 4 verso to O1 recto. (2) There is an unpaged and unsigned gathering of 4 leaves between N 4 verso and O 1 recto and the type which in (1) was on lower N 4 verso is here on the verso of the last unsigned leaf, while the text of the inserted gathering begins on lower N 4 verso.

The Fairy Queen (1692): (1) The Prologue is on a single detached leaf with blank verso in the first gathering, and the Persons are on the recto of the last leaf in the gathering, verso blank. (2) There is no separate Prologue leaf, but the Prologue and the Persons—both in the same setting of type as in (1)—are on the recto and verso respectively of the last leaf.

Thomas Shipman's *Henry the Third* (1678): (1) Preliminaries collate A^4, $**^2$ with contents: Title-page A 1 recto, Dedications to Dorchester and L'Estrange, A 2 recto-$**$ 1 recto, Prologue $**$ 1 verso-2recto, Errata list $**$ 2 recto, Persons $**$ 2 verso. (2) There is an additional preliminary two-leaf gathering signed "a" containing a dedication to Monmouth with a 2 verso blank. (3) Gathering a cancels A 2-$**$ 1 and the beginning of the Prologue (in the same setting of type as in [1] and [2]) is here on a 2 verso, blank in (2).

Mr. Bowers urges that if the various forms of the *Arte of English Poesie* "are actually separate issues, they must have been consciously sold as separate units and not in the fortuitous order in which they were bound. However, there is no evidence but that both *states* were casually distributed with no premium placed on the slightly more complete version. No purchaser picking up a copy in a bookstall would have been aware of the difference, and the seller might well have been equally ignorant" (p. 287). It may be worth noting that with the word "consciously" Mr. Bowers is here adding something to his "basic criterion" as first stated: simply "separate sale *as a consistent unit*." In any event someone did "consciously" keep the various forms of the affected

leaves of these three books separated at least until individual copies had been made up; otherwise there would have been hopeless confusion.

Moreover, it is at least debatable whether they were even then "casually distributed." A purchaser might, indeed, not notice anything at the time he bought the book but if he later found that his copy lacked something to be found in a friend's copy he might be apt to object as vigorously as the buyer of a modern book in which a gathering has been omitted. Although there might be "no premium" placed on the more complete versions, the printer and bookseller would want to avoid having to make deductions for less desirable copies, and this might quite possibly affect "conscious" distribution. Mr. F. R. Johnson notes that an Elizabethan buyer on at least one occasion required a written guarantee that a particular copy was perfect (*Library* 5th ser. I: 100, 1946-1947). Even the detached leaf in form (1) of *The Fairy Queen* would be less preferable because of the danger of losing it; in any event, there would be no reason to expect the bookseller to disturb the "consistent units" in which copies had been made up. Certainly, in the 1693 reissue of *The Fairy Queen* of copies containing one or both added songs (p. 286) the chance of buyer's complaint would be present.

So, while it is true that "separate sale *as a consistent unit*" cannot be conclusively proved in the case of variant forms such as those described above, it is also true that the books of each form were probably in a "consistent unit" prior to sale and that, in some cases at least, they may have been sold as a "consistent unit." In few cases, if any, can such sale be disproved. With books like the 1632 Shakespeare folio the copies of each variant imprint certainly were sold as a "consistent unit."

Perhaps "simultaneous issue" is not after all such a "very restricted category."

To return to Mr. Bowers' consideration of reissue: He urges that because cancel title-pages are "commonly affixed not only to

bring a book up-to-date but also to advertise any alterations which would aid sale, it is clear that publishers considered the title-page to be the chief and indeed the only form of advertisement. . . . We may . . . reasonably infer that when additions are made to the text (as McKerrow seems to imply as well) the publisher did not expect the average purchaser to be aware of them unless a new title-page advertised that these certain copies represent the book in a more attractive form than the earlier copies" (p. 289). Mr. Bowers draws an "important distinction between a *re-issue* (as well as *simultaneous issue*) and *ideal copy*. An *ideal copy* is that form of the book which the printer or publisher wished to make the most perfect and complete form to leave his shop. . . . Alterations or additions made to constitute *ideal copy* may be called *states*, whether made before or after publication; and only alterations or additions important enough to cause a cancellans title to be printed to call attention to them constitute *re-issue*. . . . By this means, at one stroke we cut away all personal decisions as to whether alterations were simple corrections or were made to stimulate sale. . . . We thus limit simple temporality (always difficult to determine) to the lapse in time between true publishing efforts. . . . With an altered cancellans title-page, made for no matter what reason, we have the only sound bibliographical evidence that is available for the kind of publishing effort which it is proper to call *re-issue*" (p. 290-291).

The concept of "ideal copy" appears to involve some difficulty. How may we know precisely what the "printer or publisher wished"? Perhaps it might be possible to infer what he wanted at the precise time when a copy of a particular form of the book was published if that time could be discovered—as unfortunately it generally cannot be. But the production and sale of a book was a lengthy process; before it was finished the printer's and/or publisher's notion of the "most perfect and complete form" of the book might change several times. Did each change in "ideal copy" result in another issue?

Mr. Bowers considers that the changes in the concept of "ideal copy" which resulted in an added gathering in some copies of the *Arte of English Poesie*, one leaf where two had been in *The Fairy Queen*, and an addition or cancellation in *Henry the Third* did not create issues. Another kind of change in the concept of "ideal copy" did not affect the text or gatherings fundamentally if at all. The two editions of Bacon's *Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh* (1622), for instance, have their titles and some portions of their text in the same setting of type, the content of each page in both editions is the same, and some running titles were used in both editions. Apparently the concept of "ideal copy" changed in regard to the setting of type and the number of copies, rather than in regard to content, while the book was printing or shortly thereafter. Mr. Bowers has elsewhere (B. S. A. Papers XL: 205-224, 1946) published an interesting account of a number of similar books. He plausibly suggests that one of these books was planned from the start to be published in two issues, the second issue with type in practically the same setting but re-imposed; and that four others were planned from the start to be published in two editions each. In both cases there was no change at all in the concept of "ideal copy"; either of two largely different settings of type or either of two different impositions of the same setting of type may be found in "that form of the book which the printer or publisher wished to represent the most perfect and complete form to leave his shop."

The alterations in all these books were made merely to "constitute *ideal copy*" and there is more reason than with the *Arte of English Poesie*, *The Fairy Queen*, and *Henry the Third* to believe that copies of the different forms were "casually distributed with no premium." Certainly "no purchaser picking up a copy in a bookstall would have been aware of the difference, and the seller might well have been equally ignorant." Yet these alterations "made to constitute ideal copy" did not create "states" but "issues" or "editions." On the other hand, if the re-imposition had

been planned ahead of time in another format, there would have been two simultaneous concepts of "ideal copy," the copies of both forms would not have been "casually distributed," and Mr. Bowers' third type of "simultaneous issue" would have resulted.

Is, then, the term "ideal copy" so flexible that it may cover (1) one edition only or (2) one issue only or (3) two editions or (4) two issues; and that a change in the concept of "ideal copy" may result in (1) a different state or (2) a different issue or (3) a different edition? If this is the case, can there be "an important distinction between a *re-issue* (as well as *simultaneous issue*) and *ideal copy*"? Perhaps even more fundamental: Must both physical make-up and printer's and/or publisher's intention be involved to create an "issue" while different physical make-up (*i.e.*, different setting of type) alone creates the far more important "edition"? "Logic," to borrow a phrase from Mr. Bowers (p. 286), "boggles at an affirmative answer."

Mr. Bowers' idea that the altered cancel title-page is the "only sound bibliographical evidence" of reissue also raises questions. It is true that if we accept it "at one stroke we cut away all personal decisions" as to why alterations were made, because it is a criterion which can be applied objectively and almost (for in a footnote on page 291 Mr. Bowers hastens to add that not *quite* all cancel title-pages mark reissues) automatically.

But this objective and automatic criterion may be applied only if we accept Mr. Bowers' own subjective "personal decisions" that (apart from a change in publishing arrangements) (1) reissue occurs only and always because of a desire to stimulate sale, and that (2) stimulation of sale is expressed only and always in a cancel title-page.

Even though it be granted, for the time at least, that stimulation of sale may be considered the only cause of reissue, it appears possible that an early printer and/or publisher did not always take an American advertising agency's view of stimulation of sale. When John Beale, for instance, issued Bacon's *Essays* in

1612 he did not bother to mention on his title-page that his collection contained nearly four times as many essays as were to be found in the collection currently being sold by John Jaggard, and that even the old essays reprinted in his new collection had been revised by the author. And when Jaggard had Beale's extra essays printed off on sheets which he added to the unsold copies of his own collection he did not change his title-page. Each of these versions had additions which "represent the book in a more attractive form than the earlier copies," but it seems doubtful if we can "reasonably infer" that "the publisher did not expect the average purchaser to be aware of them" because he did not advertise them on his title-page.

It is true that Bacon's *Essays* were extremely popular. But people normally do not buy later editions of books which they already own even if the author is popular unless the new editions are better. If the publishers felt that in an improved edition they could safely neglect possible purchasers who already owned copies of the earlier smaller collections, then it is at least possible that there were also improved reissues of the works of popular authors (such as Jaggard's post-Beale Bacon) in which stimulation of sale was not a consideration, or at least did not result in a cancel title-page. Otherwise, we are returned to the fundamental question raised by the concept of "ideal copy": Must physical make-up and a specific form of publisher's intention (*i.e.*, stimulation of sale) both be considered in determining "re-issue" but only physical make-up (*i.e.*, setting of type) in determining "edition"?

Again, there are books like the four so-called editions of Mrs. Inchbald's *Everyone Has His Fault* (1793) which, according to Mr. E. E. Willoughby, differ from one another only in the change of the statement of edition on their title-pages. This practice appears to have been rather common in the eighteenth century. The reason for such press variants appears to have been only stimulation of sale.

Finally, it is not impossible that stimulation of sale, acting in

reverse so to speak, at times even caused the printer and/or publisher to remain discreetly silent about changes which he had introduced. If, for instance, he wanted the copies of the *Arte of English Poesie* which lacked the extra gathering to sell as briskly, and at the same price, as those which contained the insertion, he would certainly not want to print a cancel title-page advertising the difference.

It would seem, then, that the concept of "ideal copy" is too inclusive for practical use and that a desire to stimulate sale did not always express itself in a changed title.

One general aspect of Mr. Bowers' distinctions deserves some consideration. He specifically excepts "difficult border line cases" in his search for a definition (p. 271) and he states that for the present he hopes only to establish general principles rather than a "complete and detailed system for dealing with every contingency" (p. 273). He calls attention to some of these contingencies in footnotes suggesting that there may be two classes of "simultaneous issue" in addition to the three he allows (p. 288), and admitting that some cancel title-pages do not create reissues (p. 291). Undoubtedly his "complete and detailed system," which he promises to publish, will include more.

But it is doubtful if a usable definition can allow so many exceptions. Each separate issue would rapidly degenerate into a class of its own, and the bibliographer might easily find himself spending more time to classify an issue or state than to discover it in the first place. Moreover, if classification is not readily apparent and automatic, it becomes subjective. Mr. Bowers, for instance, is "somewhat inclined to reserve judgment" on one of the two possible extra types of "simultaneous issue" he cites in the footnote on page 288. Another bibliographer might not be so inclined.

Mr. Bowers' definition of "issue," then, seems to be derived from McKerrow only indirectly, and it may be rather hard to apply in everyday work.

To differ from McKerrow would not be serious. The section of his *Introduction* dealing with "issue" opens (p. 175-177) with such phrases as "there is . . . difference in the use of the two words," "by 'issue' is generally meant," "the word ['issue'] is, however, very loosely used," "sometimes referred to as different 'issues,' " "is not generally regarded," "practice . . . seems . . . not to be uniform," "it is often called," and so on. McKerrow was not trying to draw up an original and elaborate, philosophical and logical system which would bind men for all time and occupy future bibliographers only with exegesis. Rather, he was quite modestly trying to state only usage and at that only usage as he thought it to be. It may be unfortunate but it is true that definitions are made by usage not by logic. This is true with the terminology of the historical sciences (of which Bibliography is one) no less than with the words of everyday life: the name "America" is a famous example.

In the twenty years since McKerrow wrote usage may have become somewhat different or at least more crystallized. Certainly many more thousands of books have been examined and several additional possible variations have turned up in the process. Mr. Bowers himself notes two major possibilities: (1) variations may occur in all parts of the book and (2) some issues appear to have been simultaneous. McKerrow wrote only of variations in preliminaries, and of reissues. Even so, students of today will follow McKerrow most truly if they, like him, try only to state current usage.

Whose usage? Mr. Bowers is quite specific on this score. He is concerned only with "advanced bibliographers" (p. 273) and hand printed books (p. 271-272); not with "catalogues of the check-list variety" (p. 272), "reference catalogues and their necessarily elementary standards" (p. 273), the "bookseller's phrase" (p. 287), or modern books (p. 271-272).

But usage in the three bibliographies which Mr. Bowers cites as the work of "advanced bibliographers" (p. 273) does not agree

with the standards he sets up. It is true that Mr. F. R. Johnson in his *Edmund Spenser* does point out that issues do not result from press corrections (p. 13-14) or from misprinted signatures (p. 26-27); but he also suggests that a misprinted catchword would be a sound basis for distinguishing between issues if a complete textual collation of several copies showed that this was the only correction made during printing (p. 33), and he sometimes refers to the same form of a book as both an "issue" and a "state" (p. 15-16 and p. 45). In the first volume of the Pforzheimer catalogue Mr. W. A. Jackson does often apply the terms "issue" and "state" as Mr. Bowers might wish; but he also sometimes describes an "issue" as resulting from a mere imprint change without cancellation (p. 170, 262, 308-309) or from internal cancellation or additions again without cancel title-pages (p. 31, 65, 94-95, 206, 265), and, like Mr. Johnson, he sometimes calls the same form of a book both an "issue" and a "state" (p. 148-149, 274). In Mr. W. W. Greg's *English Printed Drama to the Restoration* (vol. 1) the different forms of an edition are classified as "issues" or "variants," but a "reissue" is sometimes taken to be the result of a cancel which corrects wrong imposition without affecting the title-page (p. 162, 210), and "another issue" may result from mere internal additions (such as an extra dedication leaf) or cancellations (p. 149, 243, 273, 290, 345, 381, 391, 449).

Of course, it does not really matter too much if the authors of printed bibliographies disagree as to what makes an "issue." In a printed bibliography, when a bibliographer calls a form of a book an "issue" he goes on to tell exactly how the book was produced and is made up. Perhaps that form would be called an "issue" in no other printed bibliography. But, because of the bibliographer's thorough analysis, everybody knows what he is writing about and no harm has been done.

But when the word "issue" appears in a checklist catalogue, or a bookseller's catalogue, or a card catalogue, the case is different. There it must stand alone with little or no description. There,

rather than in the printed bibliography, the "accurate and precise transmission of bibliographical meaning" (p. 271) rests upon the use of the word. If the meaning is not clear much damage can be done. Unfortunately many more books are recorded in such catalogues than in printed bibliographies; and, until such books have been described in printed bibliographies, these brief catalogue entries are the only descriptions available to scholars. There is, indeed, much less "cross reference between bibliographies" (p. 271) than between bibliographies and catalogues or between catalogues and catalogues. So in any useful definition of "issue" the lowly cataloguer must be considered.

Mr. Bowers feels strongly that definitions must be "bibliographical" (p. 272, 273, 284, 286, 287, 289, 291) and "meaningful" (p. 276, 277, 284, 287, 288, 291) and he implies that current definitions, particularly those of the cataloguer, are not so. Mr. W. W. Greg has said that Bibliography is "the study of books as material objects" (*Studies in Retrospect* [London, Bibliographical Society, 1945], p. 24). The cataloguer sets forth the details of the physical appearance of the book as a material object; the bibliographer interprets those details. So long as the cataloguer's work is accurate it, no less than the bibliographer's work, must be considered "bibliographical," and if he consistently applies a specific term to a definite combination of details that term will be "meaningful"—although it may not have the meaning which Mr. Bowers would prefer.

Mr. Bowers' rejection of nineteenth and twentieth century books also appears unnecessary. As material objects an incunabulum and a modern best seller are much the same: one or more gatherings each of which was produced by folding part of a sheet of paper, a whole sheet, or more than one sheet, into a number of leaves. The only radical change in modern books is that plates make it (1) possible to print the whole book at one time after it has all been set rather than having to set and immediately print one side of a sheet at a time; and (2) possible to print any num-

ber of later impressions. This, of course, largely eliminates press corrections and introduces an additional subdivision of the "edition," namely the "impression." But neither result affects the meaning of "issue."

What, then, shall we say an "issue" is?

If cross reference between catalogues and bibliographies is to be most efficient, they must use the word with the same meaning. But because the cataloguer merely describes, he can use only words of description; for this reason "issue" also must be a word used to describe a combination of details rather than to interpret them. To the cataloguer the differences between books are simply differences; they are not changes made by any particular person for any particular reason at any particular time in the history of the book's production and sale. He finds in books two kinds of differences: (1) differences which set apart a group of books from other groups of books, and (2) differences which set apart a particular book from all other books in the group to which it belongs. A setting of type is a difference of the first kind; it sets apart one "edition" from another. Within the major group called an "edition" there may be smaller groups marked by title-page differences and/or additions and/or cancellations in any part of the book. What he calls these sub-groups does not matter to him greatly, but he generally calls them "issues." Press corrections are differences of the second type. The cataloguer normally ignores them, but when he calls the book they set apart anything it is usually "state" or "variant."

These distinctions reflect cataloguers' usage and they form the basis of the formal definitions in the American Library Association's *A.L.A. Glossary of Library Terms* (Chicago, 1943), p. 75-76. Cataloguers tend to apply these definitions consistently. Now and then a cataloguer does call a book an "issue" or even an "edition" when he normally would not do so. Usually in such a case, he is deferring to some specialist bibliographer in whose printed work the book is so described, or he is deferring to his employer

who wants to sell the book at an advantageous price. But surely all cataloguers may not justly be damned because of the vagaries of a few any more than all bibliographers need justify the curious shifts of bibliographers like T. J. Wise.

These are traditional terms which bibliographers and cataloguers have shared during the years of Bibliography's phenomenal progress. If bibliographers now reject these meanings and agree instead on intricate philosophical distinctions, that is their privilege. But thereby they will reject also the cataloguer's coöperation which has been fruitful in the past. A comparable result might be achieved in medicine if general practitioners and research specialists each were to speak an entirely different technical jargon. It is not impossible that this yearning for a distinctive and involved terminology marks only an adolescent stage in bibliographical study like that from which the allied (and also young and growing) study of Library Science is just emerging.

McKerrow's wise words are still true: "No precise definition of 'issue' or 'edition' is possible but there is among bibliographers a well-recognized difference in the use of the two words" (*Int.* p. 175).

Bibliographical Note

*The First Printing of the Constitution in a Book**

Five days after the final draft of *The Constitution* had been signed at Philadelphia, or on Saturday, September 22, 1787, there appeared in the *Pennsylvania Packet and General Advertiser*, the following announcement:

This day is published, price 3/9 in boards, By Young and M'Culloch, *Introduction to the History of America.* (To which is prefixed a map of the United States) Containing The History of Columbus. An account of the discovery and settlement of North America. Geography of the United States. History of the American War. Declaration of independence. General Washington's circular letter. Addresses of Congress and other papers relative to the Resolution. A short account of the constitution of each of the states. The temporary form of government established by Congress for the new states laid off in the vacant territory. Account of some of the natural curiosities in America. Chronological table of the most remarkable events in America. Also including the plan of the Federal Government, etc., passed by the Convention at Philadelphia, September 17, 1787.

On August 6, 1787, the Committee of Detail presented to the Convention a printed draft of the Constitution. Except for a printed proof of this draft, struck off about August 1, 1787, and corrected in the handwriting of Edmund Randolph, this is the first printing in any form of the Constitution. Two days after its adoption, or on September 19, 1787, Dunlop and Claypool's *Pennsylvania Packet* reprinted the Constitution; this being the first printing for the general public. But it is the last-named item of the above announcement in which we are presently concerned. The discovery of this announcement arose from the chance possession of a copy of *The Columbian Magazine* for September 1787, in which the Constitution appeared. Was this its first printing in a book? Extended research in the files of contemporary Philadelphia newspapers disclosed announcements of the July and August issues as appearing August 2 and September

* Acknowledgement is gratefully made to Miss Mary A. Givens, formerly of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, for her scholarly assistance and effective researches in the Philadelphia newspapers, in my behalf.

3, respectively. It may, therefore, be assumed that the September issue did not appear until some time in October. Moreover, the September issue carried news as late as the date of issue of the *Introduction to the History of America*, and so could not have preceded it. A bibliographical study of this book and a biographical sketch of the author, or rather the compiler, and one of its printers as well, may be found in *The First Text Books in American History and Their Compiler John M'Culloch*, by Alice Winifred Spieseke (New York, Teachers College, 1938). The author, however, had not seen the earlier issue of the *Introduction* described below.

In the Gilpin Library of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, there are two copies of the *Introduction*, the earliest known textbook in American history. A comparison of these volumes shows that there were two issues, the earlier of which we will designate as Copy I, and the later issue as Copy II, noting the variations between them.

Title Pages:	Identical.
Map:	Lacking in Copy I. Present in Copy II.
Pagination:	Identical to page 188.
Table of Contents:	Lacking in Copy I. Present in Copy II.
Chronology of Remarkable Events:	Lacking in Copy I. Present in Copy II.
Binding:	Original boards as called for in announcement in Copy I. Original calf in Copy II.
Paper:	Identical.
Size:	Both copies duodecimo.

The texts are identical up to page 188, which has the keyword, "Constitution," in the lower right hand corner. In Copy I, there is a separate printing of the *Constitution*, with separate title-page and pagination, while Copy II reprints the *Constitution* as a part of the book with continuous pagination agreeing with number 20471 of Evans' *American Bibliography*, which states that it was "Issued anonymously but evidently compiled by John M'Culloch, one of the publishers."

It is a coincidence that the only known copy of the earlier issue of M'Culloch's *Introduction*, and the first printing of the *Constitution*, are both in the

Historical Society of Pennsylvania. There are two copies of the later issue of the *Introduction* in the Library of Congress (one imperfect), one in the Harvard College Library, Yale University Library (Mason-Franklin Collection), and the Watkinson Library of Reference at Hartford, Connecticut. After diligent inquiry, no others have been located.

The absence of the map in the earlier issue presents a problem, for, as already stated, only one copy is known and there is no evidence that it ever contained the map called for on the title-page. The answer is further complicated by the statement in the Spieseke work referred to, that the map plate was an old one and had been used for the folding map in *Bailey's Pocket Almanac . . . 1785*.[1] Consequently, until an opportunity arises to compare this copy with others of the earlier issue of the *Introduction*, it is uncritical to state definitely that it lacked the map.

It seems only remotely probable that, when only five days after the signing of the Constitution, and three days after it was printed for the general public, the *Introduction* was published containing the *Constitution*, it could have been printed in any other work antedating M'Culloch's book. We definitely know that his *Introduction* was the earliest known textbook in American history, and it is eminently fitting that *The Constitution*, perhaps the greatest document in American history, should have been included for the instruction of our youth at the beginning of the Republic.

STUART JACKSON

[1] Francis Bailey, *Bailey's Pocket Almanac, being an American Annual Register, for the Year of Our Lord 1785; And of the Empire the Tenth.*

Book Reviews

MORSE, WILLIAM INGLIS. *The Canadian Collection at Harvard University.* Cambridge [Harvard University Printing Office], 1948. 116 pp. 9½ x 6¼ inches. (Bulletin V).

This is the fifth and, according to a note in the introduction, the last bulletin describing the Harvard collection of Canadiana. During the five years that Dr. Morse has been working with the Harvard Library, as Honorary Curator of Canadian History and Literature, the collection has been increased by some 6,500 items, and it is now one of the best in the world. It would appear to be especially strong in Canadian history, and particularly in the history of that area in the Maritime Provinces known as Acadia. In Canadian literature, except for some valuable Carman material of which I shall speak in a moment, the collection seems to be relatively weak.

The present bulletin is divided into five main sections. In addition to lists of the year's additions to the collections in the Widener and Houghton Libraries, there is a translation of *Articles Accordez Par Le Roy à la Compagnie de la Nouvelle France 16 May, 1628,* a translation of the Raudot Manuscript, 1708, and notes on Soissons and La Roche documents by William H. Bond, and a list of the Bliss Carman manuscripts in the library, together with the text of a number of that poet's letters.

It is the last section which will be of widest interest. Carman's reputation, which has been in partial eclipse for a generation, is almost certainly due for a revival. There are signs that the reaction against romanticism in poetry has almost run its course; there will be a large-scale revaluation of romantic poetry and Carman's work will be involved in this process. Though he is never likely to receive again the adulation paid him about the turn of the century, his minor but haunting and distinctive note will be recognized as having permanent interest. The manuscripts listed in this bulletin, together with those in the Lorne Pierce Collection at Queen's and

those in the Hathaway Collection at Carman's Alma Mater, the University of New Brunswick,[1] provide a basis for the re-assessment both of Carman's poetry and personality. It is a task which should be undertaken at an early date.

The publication of this bulletin gives rise to many reflections. One of these is the possibly quixotic hope that before too long one of the foundations or learned societies will sponsor a master bibliography of Canadiana; anyone who has worked in the field is aware of the immense difficulties which at present confront one in locating source material. Another is the more modest hope that the publication of this bulletin, and the development of the collection which it describes, will do something to interest American scholars in the Canadian field. As it is, the history and interpretation of Canadian culture, and particularly of Canadian literature, is left almost wholly in the hands of Canadians. Much valuable work has been and is being done; but undoubtedly many new insights would be provided by investigations from outside Canada's borders. Canada's relatively small but genuine and distinctive contribution to North American culture has been too long ignored by the continent's colossus.

Desmond Pacey

University of New Brunswick

Allen, Albert Henry, *ed. Dakota Imprints, 1858-1889*. New York, Published for the Bibliographical Society of America by R. R. Bowker Company, 1947. xx, 236 pp. 9 x 6 inches. $6.50.

It is regrettable that Douglas C. McMurtrie, whose dream it first was to produce a bibliography of pioneer western imprints, could not live to rejoice in the fruits of his labor and to share with Albert H. Allen the satisfaction that comes from work well done and so eminently worth-while. They have charted a field of source material in the Dakotas that has long been neglected and have shown the fertility of the ground for further bibliographical studies. Mr. Allen states in his introduction, "There remains

[1] The manuscripts at Queen's are listed in *Catalogue of Canadian Manuscripts Collected by Lorne Pierce and Presented to Queen's University* (1947). There is a printed catalogue of the Hathaway Collection available, but it does not give a full account of the manuscripts. There is, however, a typescript *Bibliography of the Manuscript Material in the Hathaway Collection* by R. G. Lawrence, which may be borrowed from the University of New Brunswick Library by *bona fide* scholars.

a considerable field in which collectors may yet find 'unrecorded' Dakota titles!", and it is to be hoped that future scholars may accept the challenge to explore and uncover additional documents illuminating historical, economic, and social records of the comparatively young states of North and South Dakota.

Under the W. P. A. an *American Imprints Inventory* was begun, and this together with Mr. McMurtrie's collected data form the nucleus of *Dakota Imprints, 1858-1889,* completed in 1947 under the able editorship of Albert H. Allen, Mr. McMurtrie's bibliographical associate for many years. *Dakota Imprints, 1858-1889* lists 774 titles of which 142 are broadsides, folders, or publications of similar ephemeral nature. The remaining 632 consist of pamphlets or books with the exception of one periodical (496) of exceptional interest on *Facts about North Dakota.* There are less than a dozen instances of copyrighted publications. The items included in this study cover a period from the first appearance of printing by the territorial press in 1858 through 1889 when the Dakotas attained statehood. Although the background of North and South Dakota is identical between 1858 and 1889, their separate personalities which led to inevitable separation are apparent throughout the imprints.

The introduction gives a splendid summary of the facts and conclusions brought out by the collection. In it Mr. Allen remarks that Dakotans did not depend on territorial presses for books of a cultural nature. Glancing through the Author-Subject Index one finds references that prove the Dakotans' recognition of cultural values, however. Social, political, and economic phases of territorial history are recorded that are continuously typical of this region to date. Recreation was important to the pioneer, as typified by the many broadsides advertising fairs, masquerade balls, and Fourth of July observances. Cornet bands, balloon ascensions, and good speeches were the most frequent attractions. The invitation to a buffalo hunt might well make today's sportsmen envious. Health laws were established under a Territorial Superintendent of Public Health. (One of the broadsides warns of the outbreak of a pleuro-pneumonia epidemic.) Stress was laid on education from common school to college. Living conditions from generation to generation afford amusing comparisons. The advertisements about tuition disclose, "Excellent table board from $1.90 to $2.10 per week. Tuition, room rent, fuel and light free, the student furnishing his bedding, wash-bowl, pitcher, towels and lamp." (442) The items describing teachers' salaries are equally interesting.

The chronological arrangement of the imprints together with the lively annotations make this an appealing narrative for the layman without hindering its technical value for scholars. There is an admirable evenness of bibliographical form in the body of the material which causes each item to stand out with graphic individuality. The attention to detail is noteworthy. For instance, wherever a territorial imprint is assumed, evidence is given to justify the assumption. If there is a variation in dates, contemporary history of other regions is cited, or a comparison is made with related documents. If pagination is continuous with previous items, that is stated. Because printed wrappers often contain valuable, otherwise unrecorded, data, copies complete in this respect are thoroughly described. The exactness of collating impresses one with the feeling that the items have been recorded by eye-witnesses. The comprehensive indexes to *Locations*, *Author-Subject*, *Summary of Dakota Printing by Years*, *Printing Points*, *Presses and Printers* with a *Summary of Printing Points and Items Reported* leave nothing undone to make this book of imprints a usable tool for students and reference assistants.

To make possible this splendid collection of Dakota imprints required long, diligent, and expensive research in widely scattered places. Often just one copy of an imprint rewarded the searchers. Three hundred and fifty-nine such *unica* are listed, and it is to be hoped that photostatic copies may be made before the originals are lost or discarded through unawareness of their value. Fortunately, the Dakotas are awakening to the need and usefulness of bibliographies, and this one will be appreciated for what it has accomplished in furnishing impetus and paving the way for further studies.

GENA J. BAKKEN

ALLEN, ALBERT HENRY, *ed. Arkansas Imprints, 1821-1876*. New York, Published for the Bibliographical Society of America by R. R. Bowker Co., 1947. xx, 236 pp. 9 x 6 inches. $6.50.

Straight bibliography can be as bland and unpalatable as eating hay, but this is a bright exception. The Bibliographical Society of America recognized and met an unusual need by revising and "completing" *A Check List of Arkansas Imprints, 1821-1876*, one of the many such mimeographed W. P. A. literary efforts of the late 1930 era.

Seldom if ever has Arkansas been favored by the publication of such a scholarly work as this. Our history in the national picture has neither been as epic nor as commonplace as some of our sister states; our local culture neither as full-blown nor as budding as others; and while we native sons with few exceptions have enjoyed the living of this life, we have left its interpretation, documentation, historical research, etc., largely to such scholarly outsiders as Stanley Faye, James Masterson, Grant Foreman, Douglas McMurtrie, Albert H. Allen (representing the Bibliographical Society of America) and others. The subject of this review is but another outstanding example.

Arkansas Imprints, 1821-1876 is a volume of rare importance to any student, historian, or other person interested in this section in general or Arkansas in particular. Seven hundred and sixty-six adequately identified items are listed chronologically, grouped in their year of issue. Very attractive as well as legible type has been used on fine paper with wide margins and satisfactory indices. Federal and Confederate Army orders are added in appendices, as are a list of Printing Points, Presses, and Printers, and a Summary of Items by years. Public Depositories and private collections are listed, but certain readers might note that the number of items in the individual repositories are not indicated as in the Historical Records Survey check list of 1942; this omission is certainly inconsequential, but worth mentioning.

The fact that this group actually took the painstaking care necessary to develop this scholarly work is remarkable. Outstanding students, librarians and collectors were pressed into the service of making inquiries, checking titles, editing, etc. Literally hundreds of libraries were questioned by mail or in person. The editor himself spent considerable time "on location" in order to prepare the material to meet the strictest of bibliographical requirements, and while this reviewer has given the volume only cursory examination, he has found no errors of commission to date. Mr. Allen's interpretations and explanations in the introduction are most illuminating, and give the work an extra dividend on an already good investment.

This reviewer hopes that *Arkansas Imprints, 1821-1876* will shortly be put to the many uses for which it is so admirably fitted. It can stimulate our local historians, encourage the student, and (let us hope) encourage them to emulate its scholarly approach. Certainly it has a place on the shelf not

only of every library in Arkansas, but in every library of the nation interested in source material of the various geographical areas.

A. Howard Stebbins, Jr.

Williams, Ames W., and Vincent Starrett. *Stephen Crane; a Bibliography* [Silhouette portrait]. Glendale, Calif., John Valentine, Publisher, 1948. ix, 161 pp. Plates, facsimiles. 9 x 5¾ inches. $7.50.*

Gibson, William M., and George Arms. *A Bibliography of William Dean Howells.* New York, The New York Public Library, 1948. 182 pp. Plates, facsimiles. 10 x 7 inches. Paper. $2.25.

The avowed purpose of this carefully edited and attractively designed bibliography is to assemble materials for some biographer whose approach to a biography of Stephen Crane will be rather more specific than Thomas Beer's in his impressionistic book on the novelist (*Stephen Crane; a Study in American Letters*, N. Y., Alfred A. Knopf, 1923). "The first modern American storyteller" and "perhaps the most startling figure after Poe," in the estimation of Vincent Starrett, who contributes an Introduction written with his usual charm of style, the author of *The Red Badge of Courage* offers a tantalizing and fascinating problem to a biographer who must be alert to separate fact from myth. There were, for instance, three women in Crane's life to whom he wrote letters of consequence, and who proved adamant to requests to surrender them, and any future biography must take into account the new light thrown on Cora Taylor Crane (Mrs. Stephen Crane) in James Branch Cabell's *The St. Johns; a Parade of Diversities* (N. Y., Farrar & Rinehart, 1943).

Collectors, booksellers, and librarians have assisted in the preparation of the bibliography proper, which comprises *Books and Contributions to Periodicals* (these have careful collations), *Miscellanea and Curiosa, Published Letters, Contemporary Reviews,* an alphabetical list of Crane's work, particularly useful in the case of the short stories, and *Writings Biographical and Bibliographical About Stephen Crane.* Though covering twenty-six

* The publisher's announcement stated that the bibliography "in format and typographical style meets standards set by the Bibliographical Society of America." The Society has published no standards of this kind, nor was such a statement authorized by the Society. It seems necessary to add this footnote since the Society is receiving requests for its "published standards." *Editor.*

pages, this last section is not all-inclusive, and might have been more tightly coördinated here and there. The bare entry of Edmund Wilson's anthology, *The Shock of Recognition*, does not disclose that it includes H. G. Wells's article, "Stephen Crane From an English Standpoint" (and the vivid pages on Crane in Wells's *Experiment in Autobiography* are not referred to at all). An especially curious omission from the penultimate section is Alexander Woollcott's *Second Reader* (N. Y., Viking Press, 1937), which included Crane's *Whilomville Stories*. Otherwise the net has been widely cast, listing original Crane material in two of Charles Honce's unique Christmas presentation books, for instance.

Crane, Mr. Starrett contends, was born out of season. He came on the scene at "a time when Howells, our most realistic novelist, was capable of having one New York clubman call another 'You goose!' " Yet Howells was generous in his praise of Crane's work, especially *Maggie*. There are eight references to Crane in the new (and admirably thorough and detailed) bibliography of William Dean Howells recently published by The New York Public Library. Whereas the bibliographies of Howells' work in Oscar W. Firkins' *William Dean Howells* (1924) and Mildred Howells' *Life in Letters* (1928) did not exceed ten pages in each book, this occupies 182 double-column pages and is admittedly incomplete, since it omits English and continental editions of his books, and some material to be found in previous check lists. In sixty-eight years of continuous authorship, the Preface points out, Howells published about 200 books, wholly or in part, and 1200 periodical pieces. The books and most of the articles are listed and described. His early writing is listed for the first time, especially the work signed Chispa, Godfrey or Geoffrey or Wilhelm Constant, and Will Narlie. The compilers have also tried to describe every volume in which Howells might have revised his original printed text. At some future date they hope to issue a supplementary check list of English and continental editions, of manuscript material, and of the stage productions of the farces and plays, with a calendar of the letters both printed and in manuscript.

The lack of an alphabetical index of books is a considerable handicap to quick reference use of the bibliography. To find *The Whole Family* (1908), a novel by several hands edited by Elizabeth Jordan, in which Howells took much interest and to which he contributed a chapter, this reviewer had to resort to guesswork and the trial-and-error method. The dramatist Charles Klein is spelled "Kline" in both text and index.

A new biography of Crane is certainly a desideratum. Firkins and Miss Howells have probably done all that is necessary in that respect for Mr. Howells. In any case, it will hardly be necessary to do another bibliography for either writer now that these two have appeared.

EARLE F. WALBRIDGE

NELSON, AXEL. *Alfabetets ursprung och den västerländska skriftens historia till boktryckarkonstens framträdande.* Stockholm, Hugo Gebers Förlag, 1947. 55 pp. Illus. 5 x 7½ inches. Sw. kr. 4.00 (Grafiska Institutets skriftserie, under redaktion av S.E. Bring och B. Zachrisson, No. 1.)

COLLIJN, ISAK. *Svensk boktryckerihistoria under 14- och 1500-talen.* Stockholm, Hugo Gebers Förlag, 1947. 99 pp. Facsimiles. 5 x 7½ inches. Sw. kr. 6.00. (Grafiska Institutets skriftserie, under redaktion av S.E. Bring och B. Zachrisson, No. 2.)

WOLLIN, NILS G. *Svenska stilgjuteriet: Peter Mommas skapelse.* Stockholm, Hugo Gebers Förlag, 1947. 78 pp. Facsimiles. 5 x 7½ inches. Sw. kr. 5.00. (Grafiska Institutets skriftserie, under redaktion av. S.E. Bring och B. Zachrisson, No. 3.)

Stockholm's Grafiska Institut has initiated a useful series of manuals on the book arts primarily designed for the use of its students. Printers and printing, history and illustration of the book, libraries and collectors, bibliography and palaeography have been announced as some of the subjects which will be covered. In addition to the three titles under consideration at present, the Institut will publish in the near future a history of paper up to 1860 by Gustaf Clemensson, a brief monograph on Gutenberg by Carl Björkbom, and a study of English printing by Sir Francis Meynell.

It is not the Institut's intention to publish original research, and thus far in the series each author has written a more extensive work on his subject. Axel Nelson's study of medieval palaeography appeared in Svend Dahl's *Bibliotekshandbok* in 1924, and Nils G. Wollin's *Det första svenska stilgjuteriet* was published in Uppsala in 1943 as a part of the celebration of the Svenska Boktryckarförening's semi-centennial. No bibliographer needs to be told about Isak Collijn's monumental *Sveriges bibliografi intill år 1600,* the basis of the present work as well as several other studies on the history of printing in Sweden.

Nelson's study of the origin of the alphabet and the development of oc-

cidental hands prior to the invention of printing is a good encyclopedia article, but no more. It is unfortunate that Nelson could not have been given at least as much space as Collijn. Collijn's study, the summary of a lifetime of investigation of the subject, begins with Johann Snell and Bartholomaeus Ghotan and ends with Andreas Gutterwitz, who used Greek type for the first time in Sweden in 1584.

There is no entry under "Sweden" or even "Scandinavia" in the index to Updike's *Printing Types*. In fact, Sweden had no regular type foundry until the middle of the eighteenth century, nearly three hundred years after the black art had crossed the Sound. Wollin's study covers what has hitherto been a *tabula rasa*, or at least before the publication of his original work in 1943. Urged by Peter Momma, Matthias Holmerus established the first type foundry in Sweden in 1743, and seven years later Momma himself took over the business. However, in 1764 Holmerus again assumed charge and combined his shop with the Riksbank's type foundry. In 1769 Holmerus' son, Adolph Elias, took over both foundries, but five years later the whole enterprise was forsaken. The results of this first Swedish essay in the field were, as Wollin indicates, rather mediocre. Nevertheless, they were not inferior if measured by contemporary standards.

LAWRENCE S. THOMPSON

United States Cumulative Book Auction Records, 1945-47. Edited by S. R. Shapiro . . . New York, Want List, 1947. lxiv, 957 pp. 9½ x 6⅞ inches. $20.00.

The period beginning July 1945 and extending through May 1947 includes the peak of inflation prices for rare books and the beginning of the time when money for "luxury" items became scarcer. For that reason, the auction records included in the USCBA cumulation for the period offer some interesting comparisons.

The editor's summary of leading sales is replete with comments on prices such as "very poor," "tragic," "disappointing," and "hardly encouraging." When it is noted that the sales included such collections as those of Frank J. Hogan, Eldridge R. Johnson, Fred W. Allsop, Frederick S. Peck, and many others of similar quality, the indications of a buyer's market for rare books become more clearly marked.

The three-dollar limitation on entries results in the inclusion of many titles which never have been and probably never will be again noted in published auction records.

The volume, an octavo, is more easily handled than the earlier annual quarto. The paper and type are adequate. An excellent feature of the cumulation is the fact that, unlike an index, it offers all the information in the annual volumes without need for further recourse to them.

FRED B. ROTHMAN

THE AUTHORS IN THIS ISSUE

NELSON F. ADKINS is associate professor of English literature at the Washington Square College of New York University, where he conducts the courses in American literature. He contributed *The Early Projected Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne* to the 1945 volume of the PAPERS (39: 119-155).

FREDSON BOWERS is associate professor of English at the University of Virginia, and a frequent contributor to the PAPERS.

ROBERT BENAWAY BROWN and FRANK X. BRAUN are both graduates of and faculty members at the University of Michigan. Mr. Brown, a major in the recent war, became Curator of Printed Books at the Clements Library at thirty, in July 1946. Dr. Braun, who is an instructor in German at the university, has published several articles on modern German literature.

PAUL S. DUNKIN is Senior Cataloguer at the Folger Shakespeare Library. He is author of *Post-Aristophanic Comedy* (Urbana, The University of Illinois Press, 1946), and has contributed to library and bibliographical journals.